Oxford Church Text Books

The Three Creeds

A. E. BURN

Oxford Church Text Books

The Nicene Creed

BY

THE REV. A. E. BURN, D.D.

VICAR OF HALIFAX; PREBENDARY OF LICHFIELD;
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD;
AUTHOR OF 'THE APOSTLES' CREED,' AND
'THE ATHANASIAN CREED (OXFORD CHURCH TEXT BOOKS)

SECOND IMPRESSION

RIVINGTONS
34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*
LONDON
1913

TO

MY WIFE

CONTENTS

PART I.—THE HISTORY

PART II.—THE THEOLOGY

THE NICENE CREED

PART I.—THE HISTORY

CHAPTER I

THE CREED OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA

The true history of our Nicene Creed is at last emerging from obscurity. The old theory that the Creed of the Council of Nicæa of 325 A.D. was slightly altered and enlarged at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D., is still maintained in most of the text-books on the Prayer Book, and has recently found support from a learned Professor of the Eastern Orthodox Church.[1] But its foundations have been undermined by recent research.

It was a French scholar, Denys Petau, better known as Petavius (+ 1652), of Paris, who first pointed out that our Nicene Creed had been quoted by the historian S. Epiphanius some seven years before the Council of Constantinople. But it was reserved for an English scholar, Professor Hort,[2] two centuries later, to discern the importance of the argument which may be built up on that fact. In his brilliant *Dissertation* he proved that the Creed thus quoted by S. Epiphanius was a Revision of the Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, most probably revised and enlarged by Bishop Cyril, who inserted a section taken out of the Creed of the Nicene Council. S. Cyril's revised Creed was in some way or other approved by the Council of Constantinople, and came up again for discussion at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. side by side with the original Nicene Creed

[1] See p. 27.

[2] *Two Dissertations*. Cambridge and London, 1876.

of the Council of Nicæa. At Nicæa there were present some 318 bishops, at Constantinople some 150, so the two Creeds were distinguished as the Creed of the 318 holy Fathers and the Faith of the 150 holy Fathers respectively. They were so much alike that great temptation was offered to copyists to assimilate their texts. Indeed, as we shall see, the process of corruption had already begun. In course of time the revised Jerusalem Creed, often called *Constantinopolitanum*, came to be regarded as an improved recension of the Nicene Creed, and inherited all the prestige which attached to the work of the first General Council. From one point of view this development may be justified, because the kernel of the teaching of the Nicene Council on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ was enshrined in it, leaving outside the husk of the negative warnings, the anathemas.

To make what has been said quite clear I will at once quote the two forms side by side. It is sometimes convenient, and I shall in future, for the sake of brevity, designate them N. and C. The text quoted by S. Epiphanius differs in some slight respects from the text quoted at Chalcedon as the Faith of the 150 holy Fathers of Constantinople. At this point I will quote his variations in italics. For the Greek text I must refer to the Appendix (p. 108).

The Creed of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325.	The Creed quoted by S. Epiphanius, *c.* A.D. 374.
We believe	We believe
I. 1. In one God the Father Almighty, maker of all things, both visible and invisible.	I. 1. in one God, the Father Almighty, maker both of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible.
II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, be-	II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds—*that is of the substance of the Father*—Light of Light, very God of very

gotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both those in heaven and those on earth ;

3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate, was made Man,

4. Suffered,

5. And rose the third day,

6. Ascended into heaven,

7. Is coming to judge the quick and dead.

III. 8. And in the Holy Ghost.

God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, *both those in heaven and those on earth ;*

3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made Man ;

4. And was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried.

5. And rose again the third day according to the Scriptures,

6. And ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father,

7. And is coming again with glory to judge the quick and dead ; whose kingdom shall have no end.

III. 8. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets :

9. In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

10. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.

11. We look for the resurrection of the dead,

12. And the life of the world to come.

We have now to study the events which led up to the Council of Nicæa, and the course of the discussions in which the Creed of the Council was shaped.

(1) *Arius and Arianism*

The Arian heresy had its roots far back in the distant past, but it did not derive its strength from the appeal to history. It appealed, as modern Unitarianism appeals, to the present rather than the past, to reason rather than experience, to find a compromise which may be summed up in a sentence. The Arians called Christ 'good,' but would not in the full sense call Him 'God.' Arius himself worshipped Christ as Divine, while denying His true Divinity, and during the controversy which followed the declaration of his denial of the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, many of his followers were ready, not only to worship Christ, but even to confess the essential *Likeness* of the Son to the Father. But the poison of error yields to no other antidote than undiluted truth, and at the end of the controversy Arianism identified itself with the assertion that the Son is *unlike* the Father.

History repeats itself. There are still men who refuse to call Christ God and say, 'We will call Christ the wisest of prophets, the noblest of teachers sent from God, the fairest character among the sons of men, Son of God in closest likeness to the Divine Pattern of manhood, Son by adoption from the first days of His public ministry, Son by grace continually manifested in gracious words and loving self-sacrifice, Son by perfected obedience to the Father's will, deified by the Resurrection from the dead, only like ourselves a created being, *not* the only-begotten Son of God, eternally God of God, of one essence with the Father in the sense in which the Jews understood our Lord's words: "I and My Father are one" (Jn. x. 30), and for which they tried to stone Him.' What follows? Misunderstanding, misery of wavering doubts and fears. The Arian hypothesis and its modern substitutes are in no sense a platform

from which the Science of History may advance to a reconstruction of the true human life of Christ As has been truly said, it is no platform but a slope downward from high-sounding professions of admiration for the character of Christ to sad and sombre questionings of His sinlessness and His inspiration.

As Dr. Bright has so forcibly shown, we find one root of Arianism in Jewish opposition to the full statement of the claims of Christ: 'For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God' (Jn. x. 33). Such opposition was continued by the adversaries of S. Paul, and they led some half-hearted Christians, with strong leanings towards Judaism, to take a low view of the Person of the Redeemer, and to disparage His supernatural dignity. They became Ebionites, the first heretics who anticipated Arianism.

Another root of Arianism is found in the method of Scriptural exegesis followed at Antioch, where some of the leaders of Arianism had been trained in the School of Lucian the Martyr. The theologians of Antioch took a very literal line of interpretation, which was in strong contrast to the method of Alexandrian theologians over whom the influence of Origen was supreme.

Origen's teaching, that the Word of God is eternally the Son of God, being begotten of the Father, was opposed to Arianism, and had made clear the eternal distinctions in the Godhead. But Arianism was strengthened by the widespread fear of Sabellianism. This heresy denied the eternal distinctions in the Godhead, 'confusing the Persons,' teaching that Jesus Christ is '*a fictitious* Son who is really the Father in the mask of human flesh.'[1] In spite of Origen, the truth that the Son is as personal as the Father was only dimly apprehended, because as yet there was no adequate term to express personality. Men were afraid of Sabellianism because they did not know enough about it. They were afraid, as so often happens in times of religious crisis, where no fear was.

[1] *Cf.* Pullan. *Church of the Fathers*, p. 136.

Arius was a clever and influential parish priest, in the district of Alexandria known as Baucalis. He is described as tall, with a melancholy, thoughtful face, a grave manner, and a pleasant voice. It came to the ears of the Bishop, Alexander, that he had been speaking of Christ as only the eldest and highest of God's creatures, not denying Him the title God, but explaining away its meaning. Remonstrances, followed by an interview, produced no effect. At a meeting of clergy the Bishop spoke strongly. Arius was sure enough of himself and his own opinions to criticise very severely the terms of the Bishop's address as favouring the Sabellian heresy. He found a large circle of admirers who dreaded Sabellianism, who were ready to believe that the idea of an eternal Sonship is unthinkable, who were ready to follow the popular preacher when he rationalised the idea of the Christian Trinity.

So Arius led on, and was led on by the multitude. It is so easy to start a popular movement and so hard to control it. He was carried away by a false logic. Arius asked, What does the name *Son* mean? If the Son is a Son, He must have come into existence after His Father. Once He did not exist. There was a time when the Son was not. His logic seemed to require a further deduction. If there was a time when the Son was not, then He was not uncreated, but a creature. Arius brought himself into a dilemma. Either he must be considered to teach that there are two Gods ; a higher and a lower, or must be considered to teach that it is right to worship a created being, which is idolatry. It would only have been possible for him to escape from this dilemma by denying to the Lord both divinity and worship.

The fact was that Arius was utterly short-sighted. In spite of warnings, he insisted on translating his theories into popular forms, wrote songs which were set to tunes used for licentious and comic songs, and encouraged idle gossip on the deepest mysteries of theology.

S. Gregory of Nyssa describes the situation as it presented itself to him some years later very vividly. 'Men of yesterday and the day before, mere mechanics, offhand dogmatists in theology, servants too, and slaves that

had been flogged, runaways from servile work, are solemn with us and philosophise about things incomprehensible. Ask about pence, and the tradesman will discuss the Generate and the Ingenerate. Inquire the price of bread, and he will say, "Greater is the Father and the Son is less." Say that a bath would suit you, and he defines that "the Son is out of nothing."'

Speculation ran riot, and the mischief began not with the fact that questions were asked by all sorts and conditions of men, but with the irreverent spirit in which they were asked.

The controversy grew and spread from Alexandria to Palestine. Finally, the news of disturbances caused by it came to the ears of the Emperor Constantine, who sent Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, to make peace. But Hosius was unsuccessful even with the support of a strongly worded letter from Constantine. Then the Emperor took the momentous step of summoning a General Council of all the Bishops of the Christian Church.

(2) *The Council of Nicæa.*

The Council met at Nicæa, in the province of Bithynia, in the North West corner of Asia Minor. It was a place well adapted for such a gathering, easily approached by sea or land, the great Roman roads radiating from it in all directions. The admirable posting arrangements of the Imperial Civil Service were requisitioned. The bishops with their attendants travelled at the public expense. Thus gathered more than three hundred bishops from all the important centres of Church life, from Egypt, Syria, Asia, Western Asia, Greece, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Sicily, and our own Britain. The attendant priests and deacons swelled the number to some fifteen hundred.

The earliest meetings of the Council were held in a church, afterwards in an oblong hall of the Imperial palace, with benches and chairs ranged along the sides. In the centre, on a raised seat, was set a copy of the Holy

Gospels. The Emperor sat on a small throne, in a scarlet robe blazing with jewels. His most trusted adviser Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, was on one side; on the other, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, the great Church historian. There met old and young; aged bishops who had lived through the last and fiercest of the persecutions, veteran soldiers of the Cross who had come out of the battle scarred and mutilated by torture; and with them came beardless deacons who could barely remember the publication of the Emperor's edict of toleration, which had opened a new era of Church extension. It was, indeed, the character of the great company of confessors of the Faith which gave so much weight in after years to the decisions of the Council.

Prayers were read and an address was presented to the Emperor, who exhorted them to unity. Then the deliberations began. It seems to have been decided very soon that the only way to end the controversy was to draw up a form of creed as a test of orthodoxy to be signed by bishops, without any idea of substituting it for the Baptismal creeds of the churches.

At first the Bishops endeavoured to agree on some Scriptural argument which should effectually exclude the Arian theory. To their dismay the Arian leaders found that they could not count on the support of more than some seventeen bishops. Their confidence of a speedy victory had been misplaced, so they sought refuge in evasion. When the traditional Scriptural phrases, which were held to teach the eternal Godhead of the Son, were brought up, they acquiesced, whispering to one another and hinting how each phrase might be emptied of its meaning. The scene has been vividly described by S. Athanasius:

'When the bishops said that the Word must be described as the True Power and Image of the Father, in all things exact and like the Father, and as unalterable, and as always, and as in Him without division (for never was the Word not, but He was always, existing everlastingly with the Father, as the radiance of light), Eusebius[1] and his fellows endured indeed, as not daring to contradict, being put to shame by the arguments which were

[1] Of Nicomedia.

urged against them, but instead they were caught whispering to each other and winking with their eyes, that "like," and "always," and "power," and "in Him," were, as before, common to us and the Son, and that it was no difficulty to agree to these. As to "like," they said that it is written of us, "Man is the image and glory of God," (1 Cor. xi. 7): "always," that it was written, "For we which live are alway" (2 Cor. iv. 11): "in Him," "In Him we live and move and have our being" (Acts xvii. 28): "unalterable," that it is written, "Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ," (Rom. viii. 35, *Who shall separate*): as to "power," that the caterpillar and the locust are called "power" and "great power" (Joel ii. 25), and that it is often said of the people, for instance, "All the power of the Lord came out of the land of Egypt" (Ex. xii. 41): and there are others also, heavenly ones, for Scripture says, "The Lord of powers is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge" (Ps. xlvi. 7). Indeed, Asterius, by title the Sophist, had said the like in writing, having learned it from them, and before him Arius, having learned it also, as has been said. But the bishops discerning in this too their dissimulation, and whereas it is written, "Deceit is in the heart of the irreligious that imagine evil" (Prov. xii. 20), were again compelled on their part to collect the sense of the Scriptures, and to resay and rewrite what they had said before, more distinctly still, namely, that the Son is "one in essence"[1] with the Father; by way of signifying that the Son was from the Father, and not merely like, but the same in likeness, and of showing that the Son's likeness and unalterableness was different from such copy of the same as is ascribed to us, which we acquire from virtue on the ground of observance of the commandments.'[2]

The day of the decisive meeting came, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, apparently convinced that half measures were useless, presented a statement of his belief, in which the Arian belief was concisely expressed. It was met with angry clamour and the document was torn to pieces.

Then came forward Eusebius of Cæsarea, renowned for his great services to Christian learning, but as Professor Gwatkin says, 'neither a great man nor a clear thinker.' His theology was hazy, and he was spokesman for the great bulk of the bishops who came from Syria and Asia Minor, and had little knowledge of Arianism and small capacity to discern its danger. Eusebius produced a

[1] Gk. *homo-ousios.* [2] *De decretis*, 20.

formula, consisting of the creed of his own church, together with an addition modelled on the Creed of Lucian and directed against Sabellianism.

This, he said, was what he had learnt as a catechumen and taught as a priest and a bishop. From the point of view of Scripture and tradition it was irreproachable. But it laid no emphasis on the eternal Sonship. Its phrases 'First begotten of all creation' and 'before all ages' might mean, as Gwatkin points out, 'begotten (not eternally, but) before other things were created.' 'Its "God of God" was no more than Arius had repeatedly confessed, while its solitary "was made flesh" left the whole doctrine of the Incarnation in uncertainty.'[1]

The Emperor expressed his approval, but was prompted it seems by Hosius to insert the word *homo-ousios* 'of one substance.' Eusebius of Cæsarea confesses in his letter that the word was of old usage in the Church. Tertullian has the phrase 'of the substance of the Father.'[2] Possibly Origen had used the word.[3] It means, as has been well said, 'the inmost being of the Father, His very self. The translation "substance" which comes to us through the Latin (substantia = essentia) is not satisfactory. "Essence" hardly conveys to English ears the real meaning, and "nature" too is strictly quite inadequate. The phrase is intended to mark the essential unity of the Son with the Father, declaring that He has His existence from no source external to the Father, but is of the very being of the Father—so that the Father Himself *is* not, does not exist, is not conceived of as having being, apart from the Son.'[4]

The word had been used by Paul of Samosata, and according to some writers had been condemned by a Council at Antioch in A.D. 269. But the evidence is conflicting, and for our present purpose it does not matter whether the earlier Council had condemned it or

[1] Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 42.
[2] *In Prax.*, 4. [3] *Vid.* Pamph. *Apol.*, 5.
[4] Bethune-Baker, *Introd. to Early Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, p. 168 *n.* 5.

	The Creed of Eusebius.	The Creed of the Council.
	We believe	We believe
I. 1.	in one God, the Father Almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible.	in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible.
II. 2.	And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, Son Only-begotten, first born of every creature, before all the ages, begotten from the Father, by whom also all things were made;	And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both those in heaven and those on earth;
3.	Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived as a citizen among men,	Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was made flesh, and lived as Man among men,
4.	And suffered	Suffered,
5.	And rose again the third day,	And rose the third day.
6.	And ascended to the Father,	Ascended into heaven.
7.		
8.	And will come again in glory to judge the quick and dead.	Is coming to judge the quick and dead.
III. 9.	And we believe also in one Holy Ghost:	And in the Holy Ghost
	Believing each of these to be and to exist, the Father truly Father, and the Son truly Son, and the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost, as also our Lord, sending forth His disciples for the preaching, said, 'Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Concerning whom we confidently affirm that so we hold, and so we think, and so we have held aforetime, and we maintain this faith unto the death, anathematising every godless heresy.	But those who say 'Once He was not,' and 'Before He was begotten He was not,' and 'He came into existence out of what was not,' or 'That the Son of God was of a different essence (hypostasis) or being (ousia),' or 'That He was made,' or 'is changeable or mutable,' those the Catholic Church anathematises.

not. They had certainly not condemned it in the sense in which it was used by the Nicene Council.[1]

On the other hand Arius had disclaimed it,[2] and Eusebius of Nicomedia had written in a letter: 'If we call Him the Son of the Father and uncreate, then are we granting that He is one in essence (*homo-ousios*).' According to S. Ambrose,[3] this influenced the Council in adopting the term.

It is a mistake to suppose that S. Athanasius insisted on it as essential. So long as men held the truth which it conveyed, he was content. His attitude towards it was always loyal, but as Loofs puts it: 'He was moulded by the Nicene Creed, did not mould it himself.'[4]

Having decided this crucial point, the Council determined to overhaul the Creed yet further, and made some other important changes.

The word 'Son' was put first in place of Logos (Word). The insertion of 'that is of the substance of the Father' as well as 'of one substance,' and 'God of God,' was specially directed against Eusebius of Nicomedia. Dropping 'life of life' and 'first born of all creation,' they inserted 'true God of true God,' and then resumed 'begotten not made' parallel to 'begotten of the Father,' contrasting the two participles which the Arian confused.

To 'was incarnate' they added 'lived as man among men.' In Gwatkin's words, 'Thus the Lord took something more than a mere human body: but it was left undecided whether He assumed human nature or merely entered into union with a man. Nestorian error on the Incarnation is still left open, but Arian is shut out.'[5]

To the Creed were added anathemas, as Mr. Turner says, 'only because the Creed is no longer the layman's confession of faith, but the bishop's. The old principle that the profession of belief of catechumens should be positive in character is not infringed: the Council has not even in view the case of the clergy, still less that of

[1] See Gibson, p. 126.
[2] Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 69.
[3] *De fide*, iii. 7.
[4] *Leitfaden*, p. 151.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

the faithful laity : to bishops alone belonged the office of deciding in the last resort what was Christian and Catholic and what was heretical, and therefore bishops alone should be called upon to guarantee their soundness in the faith by formal and solemn anathema of error.'[1] The minatory clauses of the Athanasian creed are not anathemas. For anathemas are punishments pronounced by the rulers of the Church, while the minatory clauses are warnings uttered by the congregation for their own good.

The amended Creed was not accepted without protracted debate. Some feared that Manichaean explanations might be given of the term 'substance.' Others that it would lead to Sabellian confusion of the Persons. Many objected to the term because it was not found in Scripture.

At last the end came. The victory was complete. The men who best understood Arianism were most determined in opposing it. Only two Egyptian Bishops, Theonas and Secundus, refused to sign. Some of the Arians signed to please the Emperor. Gregory of Nazianzus quotes them as saying, 'The soul is none the worse for a little ink.'[2] Eusebius of Nicomedia signed with a mental reservation. Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote an elaborate apology to make the best of what he felt to be an unpleasant business, and as far as possible to explain away the meaning of the terms to which he objected.

Arius and his supporters, Theonas and Secundus, were exiled. Arian writings were burnt. The Emperor gave a great feast to celebrate the twentieth year of his reign.

(3) *The Great Controversy*

A reaction was inevitable. For, in addition to the genuine Arians, there were a great many bishops of old-fashioned ways of thought who were very much afraid of Sabellianism, and disliked the use of 'unscriptural' terms like *homo-ousios*. Within a few years Eusebius of Nicomedia was recalled to favour at Court, and found

[1] *Hist. and Use of Creeds*, 1906, p. 28. [2] Or., xviii. 17.

many supporters, although for a long time his party were unable to declare their policy. The first step was to obtain the recall of Arian leaders on the strength of their general professions of orthodox belief. The next was to attack Nicene leaders. On various pretexts S. Athanasius, who had succeeded Alexander as Bishop of Alexandria, and Marcellus of Ancyra, were deposed from their sees. They came back after Constantine's death, but were soon again exiled. The way was then prepared for a further attack on the Nicene Creed, not so much by openly denying it, as by replacing it with something else. The Arians tried to find a formula which every one who disliked the word *homo-ousios* would accept.

In A.D. 341 a Council met on the occasion of the dedication of Constantine's Golden Church at Antioch. The Arian bishops under Eusebius formed a compact body, and began the work of Creed making. While professing to accept the Nicene Creed they brought forward another, which was rejected. Then a Creed was agreed upon which is commonly called the *Second Creed of Antioch*. It is of some importance, because it afterwards became a stepping-stone by which some semi-Arians later on advanced to full acceptance of Nicene language. It is catholic in the assertion of 'the exact likeness of the Son to the Father's essence.' The word 'essence,' honestly accepted, would confute any attempt to explain it away by the mental reservation that this had not been always true. Catholic also is the phrase 'mediator between God and men.' But it marks the beginning of a doctrinal reaction. The phrases which Eusebius of Cæsarea had proposed to exclude Sabellianism reappear.[1] What is more important, the term *homo-ousios* is omitted. Under such circumstances it was of little avail to beat up Scriptural phrases to defend the Lord's Divinity. The Arians gained by this creed. As Gwatkin says, 'they could not expect any direct sanction for their doctrine; but they could return to the Church as soon as it had ceased to be expressly forbidden. But if the Arians came in at one door, the Nicenes went out at another. There

[1] *Vid.* my *Introduction*, p. 83.

was no alternative; for when once the controversial clauses had been solemnly inserted in the creed, it was impossible to drop them without making the Lord's Divinity an open question.'[1]

When the way had once been opened for making new creeds the art flourished. The party that rallied round Eusebius of Nicomedia were not agreed among themselves. And directly they ventured to declare a policy of their own, the party began to fall to pieces. They made creed after creed, but all in vain. The political Arians, or Eusebians, were willing to say that the Son is like (*homoios*) the Father, or even essentially like (*homoi-ousios*). Both these terms had been used by S. Athanasius himself, as compatible with *homo-ousios*. But the ultra-Arians, arguing from the point of view that likeness is a relative term, and may imply some degree of unlikeness, rejected the word *homoi-ousios*, and tried to twist the word *homoios* into a conformity with their own tenets. They really held that the Son is unlike (*anomoios*) the Father. A new coalition was engineered by Valens, an Arian bishop of the younger generation, between the ultra-Arians and those political Arians who only wished to say that the Son is like (*homoios*) the Father. They met in a small synod at Sirmium in A.D. 357, and completely overreached themselves. They asserted the unique Godhead of the Father, and the subjection of the Son to the Father, proscribing both *homo-ousios* and *homoi-ousios*, and all discussion of the word 'essence' as applied to God. Thus the way was left open for the ultra-Arians or Anomœans to maintain 'the essential unlikeness' of the Son to the Father. But this trumpet-blast of defiance, which more clearly than anything revealed the duplicity of the Arians, frightened the more moderate men, who had hitherto lent them their support. They met at Ancyra in 358, and drew up a statement of their belief, which was almost Nicene. When the Emperor Julian came to the throne his policy was to kill the Church, by restoring the exiles, and allowing free scope for intestine quarrelling. But the result was very different from his expectations.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 66.

Pressed by the tyranny of first one and then another Arian party, the more old-fashioned bishops and the semi-Arians swayed over to the Nicene doctrine. 'Bishop after bishop came over to the Athanasian side, creed after creed was remodelled on the Nicene.' But the death of Julian delayed the ultimate triumph for twenty years. The Eastern Emperor was a mere tool in the hands of Arian intriguers like Valens and Ursacius, who said that the Son is 'like' the Father, but tolerated and even supported the doctrine that He is unlike.

The Emperor Valens vigorously persecuted those who upheld the Nicene creed. But he could not stay the flowing tide. A new generation of theologians was growing up, full of admiration for the noble spirit of Athanasius, and much moved by the appeal of his work *On the Councils*, in which he exposed Arian intrigues, and asked for prayer that all strife and rivalry might cease, and futile questionings be condemned, and strifes about words, and that the truth might shine again in the hearts of all.

S. Basil the Great, at that time a young deacon, who had accompanied S. Basil of Ancyra from the Synod of Seleucia to Constantinople, adopted the words of S. Athanasius: 'One God we confess, one in nature not in number, for number belongs to the category of quantity . . . neither Like nor Unlike, for these terms belong to the category of quality . . . He that is essentially God is coessential with Him, that is, essentially God. . . . If I am to state my own opinion, I accept 'Like in essence,' with the addition of 'exactly,' as identical in sense with 'coessential' . . . but 'exactly like' [without 'essence'] I suspect. . . . Accordingly since 'coessential' is the term least open to abuse, on this ground I too adopt it.'[1] It is of great importance to notice this and similar statements of S. Basil. It has in recent years been said by some scholars such as Dr. Harnack and Professor Seeberg, that after A.D. 362 the Antiochenes and the Cappadocian fathers, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nyssa and S. Gregory of Nazianzus, really surrendered the Nicene position, and were followed by the rest of the

[1] Ep. viii. 9.

Catholic Church at the Council of Constantinople. It is urged that while they accepted the word *homo-ousios* they interpreted it in a sense which made it equivalent to *homoi-ousios*. They are therefore said to have founded a new orthodoxy which was substantially Semi-Arian. But it would be far more true to say that they only accepted *homoi-ousios*, so far as it implied *homo-ousios*. Neither they, nor the Church as a whole, would have committed the folly of giving away the truth that the Son of God is essentially divine. The theory of Dr. Harnack that the Church exchanged a belief in the essential unity of being, for a belief in a mere likeness of being, has thus been fitly criticised by Mr. Bethune-Baker.

'This is in effect to say, that it was permitted to believe in three beings with natures like each other: *ousia* receiving a sense more nearly equivalent to "nature" than to "being." Instead of one Godhead, existing permanently—eternally—in three distinct forms or spheres of existence, there would be three distinct forms of existence of like nature with each other, which together make up the Godhead. This amounts to saying that a doctrine which is hardly to be distinguished from polytheism, except in the limitation of the number of Gods to three, was ultimately accepted by the Church. Such a conclusion would indeed be a scathing satire on the work of councils and theologians . . . the Nicene Faith at last triumphant—the whole Church of the East at last convinced that its terms alone express and safeguard so much of the truth as human minds can apprehend: the Nicene Creed again affirmed—its chief watchword proclaimed: and all in a different! the very sense of that very rival term against which the whole battle had been waged.'[1] 'But this new reading of history is a paradox. It is not really supported by the evidence cited in its favour.'[2]

One word in conclusion on the history of the Creed in the West. Hilary of Poitiers was a man of good birth, highly educated, a student of New-Platonism, who was

[1] *Texts and Studies*, vol. vii. No. 1. Cambridge, 1901.
[2] *Introd. to Early Hist. of Christian Doctrine*, p. 194.

converted to Christianity in the maturity of his powers. He came to the faith as S. Augustine says 'like Cyprian and others with the gold and silver and raiment of Egypt.' He became a Bishop about 350 A.D. Three years later, when S. Athanasius was condemned by a Council at Arles on false charges of immorality, Hilary was probably present and accepted the Emperor's word. Two years afterwards he discovered his mistake and took his side with the persecuted Nicene party. From his own lips we hear that he never heard the Nicene Creed until exiled for the truth which it guarded. He was charged with fomenting political discord. If he had kept quiet he would have been left alone. As it was he was banished to Asia Minor, which was a fatal mistake of Arian policy. He was thus brought into touch with the Nicene leaders, and all his vigour of mind was exerted to explain the East to the West, to remove misunderstanding, to second the great work of S. Athanasius when he laboured to win the confidence of the Semi-Arians. When he was allowed to return to Gaul the victory was assured. Arianism won partial and local supremacy at the courts of conquering Gothic kings, but the tide of Nicene influence was always rising, and the high tide of Gallican orthodoxy in the fifth century under the great bishops of the school of Lerins, Hilary of Arles, Lupus, Faustus, Cæsarius, spread eventually to Visigothic Spain.

The following words of S. Hilary of Poitiers can never be quoted too often to prove how sincerely, and modestly, and faithfully he accepted the teaching of the Creed. Alone they offer sufficient proof that its advocates were not dryasdust dogmatists, eager only for verbal and logical triumphs :—

'Faithful souls would be contented with the word of God which bids us "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." . . . But we are drawn by the faults of our heretical opponents to do things unlawful, to scale heights inaccessible, to speak out what is unspeakable, to presume where we ought not. And whereas it is by faith alone that we should worship the Father, and reverence the Son, and be filled with the Spirit, we are now obliged to

strain our weak human language in the utterance of things beyond its scope; forced into this evil procedure by the evil procedure of our foes. Hence, what should be matter of silent religious meditation must now needs be imperilled by exposition in words.'[1]

We come back to the problem of problems. Were S. Hilary and S. Athanasius playing with shadows? Or were they able to see a little better than others, yet as in a glass darkly, something more of the light of truth? S. Hilary, like S. Augustine after him, based the doctrine of the Trinity on the baptismal formula of the Christian Church. As Dr. Illingworth has well said: 'The resulting creeds are nothing more than the authorised epitomes of what, in view of their composers, the Gospels contain. Concrete facts when they are translated into the terms of science or philosophy look very unlike themselves. A daisy, for example, is not like its botanical description, nor a sonata like its musical score. And so the simple password that gives entrance into a world-wide family, will naturally differ from the intellectual statement of what a great religion means.'[1]

Such then is the history of the first Nicene Creed. It is the monument of a long struggle, in which the early hopes that centred round the great Council were doomed to disappointment. Debate brought not peace but a sword. Yet the conflict developed in the defenders of the faith finer qualities than would have been fostered by undisturbed prosperity. In the words of S. Hilary of Poitiers: 'But I trust that the Church by the light of her doctrine, will so enlighten the world's vain wisdom, that even though it confute not the mystery of the faith, it will recognise that in our conflict with heretics we and not they are the true representatives of that mystery. For great is the force of truth: not only is it its own sufficient witness, but the more it is assailed the more evident it becomes; the daily shocks which it receives only increase its inherent stability. It is the peculiar property of the Church that when she is buffeted she is triumphant, when she is assaulted with argument she

[1] *De Trin.*, ii. 1, 2. [2] *Divine Immanence*, p. 153.

proves herself in the right, when she is deserted by her supporters she holds the field.'[1]

The first Nicene Creed, with its anathemas, was not designed for use as a Baptismal Creed nor in Public Worship. It was put forward as, and it remained, a standard of orthodoxy for Bishops as responsible teachers of the Church. In this respect it is a document of the highest importance, because it summed up what the commonsense of the Church agreed on as the teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] *De Trin.*, vii. 4.

CHAPTER II

THE CREED CALLED 'CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM'

Our so-called 'Nicene' Creed is a local Baptismal Creed which was enlarged by the insertion of Nicene terms at the time when S. Athanasius appealed to Conservatives to adopt the term *homo-ousios* as guarding the sense of Scripture. It is not the first Nicene Creed, enlarged by the Council of Constantinople, because it is based on the Creed of Jerusalem, on which S. Cyril of Jerusalem comments in his catechetical lectures. Comparison of the two forms will make this at once apparent. Secondly, it was quoted by S. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, some years before the Council of Constantinople, so that we may say with confidence that that Council did not in any sense compose it. Thirdly, although our knowledge of the proceedings at the Council are very meagre, we can say with some confidence that they pledged themselves to acceptance of the first Nicene Creed at the same time that they also accepted our form as in some sense an improved revision of it.

(1) *S. Cyril of Jerusalem and his Creeds*

S. Cyril of Jerusalem as a young man, A.D. 345, was Catechist at the great Church which the Emperor Constantine had built on Golgotha. When he spoke of the Cross he reminded his hearers that they stood on holy ground. He was an earnest and practical teacher, who turned his attention chiefly to the moral training of his catechumens. His attitude to the first Nicene Creed was the typical attitude of the pious Conservative, who suspected all terms which were not Scriptural. Thus he

never mentioned the Nicene Creed, but significantly told his hearers that their own Creed of Jerusalem was not put together by the will of men, but had been 'built up strongly out of all the Scriptures.'[1] In fact, he seldom touched on the great dogmatic controversy of the day. This was not because he did not recognise the influence of faith on conduct. He was careful to instruct his hearers according to the proportion of faith taught in their Baptismal Creed. And he warned them vigorously against strange errors of Gnostic Jews and Samaritans, which would cut away their historic faith by its roots. He refers to two Creeds, a shorter form which was used at the moment of Baptism, and a longer form which they were required to repeat on the day when they stood up in the great congregation to make their vows of Renunciation and Faith.

Earliest Creed of Jerusalem, A.D. 347

I. 1. I believe in the Father,
II. 2. And in the Son,
III. 9. And in the Holy Ghost,
11. And in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

This first creed was evidently regarded as a summary of the second, convenient for use at the supreme moment of their reception into the Holy Church. At the same time it is plain that this was the basis upon which the other was built up. In its simplicity it reminds us of the teaching of S. Peter on the day of Pentecost, and may go back to very early days in the history of the Church in Jerusalem.

S. Cyril's second creed is like a map of geological strata which are shown to witness to their gradual formation.

[1] *Cat.*, v. 12.

THE CREED OF JERUSALEM IN A.D. 347

CYRIL, *Cat.*, vi-xviii.

I. 1. We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father, very God, before all worlds, by whom all things were made,
3. and was incarnate, and was made man,[1]
4. was crucified and was buried,
5. and rose again the third day
6. and ascended into heaven,
7. and sat at the right hand of the Father,
8. and is coming in glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.

III. 9. And in one Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake in the prophets,
11. and in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,
10. and in one Holy Catholic Church,
12. and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life eternal.

The term 'Only begotten Son' and the title 'Paraclete' point us back to the teaching of S. John. The word 'Catholic' reminds us of the teaching of Ignatius the martyr bishop of Antioch. The words 'whose kingdom shall have no end' seem to be a recent addition, guarding against the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra.[2]

S. Cyril's teaching on these points is full of interest, and shall be quoted more fully when we come to deal with the theology of his revised Creed. It is necessary at this point to keep strictly to the history of the form. There is only one other point which must be taken before

[1] The original word (*ἐνανθρωπησάντα*) rather expresses the thought, 'lived among men as man' (Westcott).

[2] See p. 75.

we pass on to discuss the evidence of S. Epiphanius. The order of the articles reveals unmistakably the dependence of the second Creed on the first. The Art. 11 on Baptism precedes the Art. 10 on the Church, if we number them in the usual order according to their subject-matter.

11. And in one Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.
10. And in one holy Catholic Church.

It is evident that the Jerusalem Creed has grown up round the framework of the original short Creed.

(2) *S. Epiphanius of Salamis*

Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, was a man who had travelled, and had many good men among his friends. The violence of his temper and his pedantry have somewhat damaged his reputation as a theologian. But we may say that he was beyond question learned, and did a great work in his diocese.

In the year A.D. 374 he wrote a book called *The Anchored One*, for the instruction of some priests and leading Churchmen of Syedra in Pamphylia, who had applied to him for an exposition of Catholic teaching on the Trinity. The title of his book promised to those who had been tossed on stormy seas of doubt that they should find ar anchor of the soul.

He quoted two Creed forms—(i) our Nicene Creed, (ii) an elaborate paraphrase of the original Nicene Creed. We gather that the former had been introduced into his diocese as a Baptismal Creed before his consecration to the episcopate, which took place in A.D. 367. He regarded it as the Creed of the Apostles explained by the Nicene Fathers, and added to it their anathemas, with some variations. The latter creed seems to have been his own composition for the use of converts, who had held heretical opinions. It is verbose and wearisome, and need not detain us.

Dr. Bindley makes the important suggestion that the words with which S. Epiphanius introduces this creed may

with one simple emendation, the addition of the word [and], be taken to imply that the creed was composed of Apostolic, Jerusalem, and Nicene elements: Epiphanius says, 'And this Faith was handed down by the holy Apostles and in the Church, the holy city [and] from all the holy bishops together, above the number of three hundred and ten.' [1]

Creed quoted by S. Epiphanius

Ancoratus ad fin.

I. 1. We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things *both* visible and invisible.

II. 2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds—*that is of the substance of the Father,*—Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, *both that are in heaven and that are in earth;* who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven,

3. and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man;
4. and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried,
5. and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures,
6. and ascended into heaven,
7. and sitteth at the right hand of the Father,
8. and is coming again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

III. 9. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets:

[1] *Oecumenical Documents*, ed. 2, p. 302.

10. in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.
11. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.
12. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.

We must turn to the distinctive features of this revised Creed to note first how it differs from the text which we use to-day. These slight variations are probably due to copyists of the text of S. Epiphanius—Art. 1, *both*; Art. 2, *that is of the substance of the Father, both the things in the heavens and the things on the earth.* Two others are of importance. In Art. 2, *God of God,* in Art. 9, *and the Son,* are absent. The history of their introduction must be reserved to the next chapter, together with a discussion of the reason why the word *holy* in Art. 10 has been omitted from our English translation.

There are three important changes upon which Dr. Hort based his main argument that S. Cyril was the author of this revision. The change from '*sat*' to sitteth in Art. 7, agrees with the teaching in his lectures that the Son was from all eternity sitting at the right hand of the Father, and not only after the Ascension.[1] The change from '*in glory*' to '*with glory*' in Art. 8 is in accordance with Cyril's teaching, *Cat.*, xv. 3. The most important is the change from '*resurrection of the flesh*' to '*resurrection of the dead,*' in accordance with his interpretation of the clause (*Cat.*, xviii. 1-21), and his habitual phrase.

Upon these changes Dr. Hort based his argument that S. Cyril on his return from exile to his diocese in A.D. 362-364 would find a natural occasion for the revision of the public creed by the skilful insertion of some of the Conciliar language, including the term which proclaimed the restoration of full communion with the champions of Nicæa, and other phrases and clauses adapted for impressing on the people positive truth.[2]

Dr. Hort traced other changes to the following sources, '*under Pontius Pilate,*' '*and Apostolic*' (Church), '*life of*

[1] *Cat.*, xi. 17; xiv. 17-30. [2] *Dissertation*, p. 91.

the age to come' to the creed of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, together with *'from the heavens,' 'for us,' 'suffered,' 'again'* (with glory). The Mesopotamian Creed supplies a parallel for the omission of *'of repentance'* after *'one baptism.'* 'The Paraclete' seems to have been omitted because of 'the accompanying enlargement.'

It is easy to prove that S. Epiphanius had connections with Jerusalem. He had lived for some time in Palestine. He shows knowledge of circumstances relating to Jerusalem, Eleutheropolis, near his birthplace, and Cæsarea. He gives a list of Bishops of Jerusalem who lived through the troublous times. In A.D. 377 he corresponded with S. Basil about some quarrels among the brethren on the Mount of Olives.

Dr. Hort's theory has commended itself to the great majority of writers on the subject both in England and in Germany. Dr. Kattenbusch accepted it enthusiastically with the words, 'The only wonder is that it was not discovered before.'

But the theory has lately been called in question by a Russian scholar, Professor Lebedeff of Moscow, who holds that Epiphanius' text has been deliberately altered. He thinks that Epiphanius gave the original Nicene Creed, that the later text has been interpolated; also that the early Creed of Jerusalem was the invention of scholars. His arguments are not convincing.

Hort's theory has also been called in question by the Bishop of Gloucester,[1] whose arguments deserve detailed consideration. He directs attention to the fact that there is in the second division of the Creed 'a considerable amount of material that is new both to the Creed of Nicæa and to the Creed of Jerusalem, so that even if the Creed of Jerusalem lies at the basis of the enlarged Creed, it has been raised by the help of other creeds, as those of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Church of Antioch.' As a matter of fact these sources may be for practical purposes regarded as one. It is generally recognised that the Seventh Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* was put together by an unknown writer at

[1] Dr. E. C. S. Gibson, *The Three Creeds*, p. 169, *note* c.

Antioch *c.* 375 A.D.,[1] so that its evidence is only evidence that such and such phrases were used and appreciated by one or more writers of the Church in Antioch, at or soon after, the time when S. Cyril may be supposed to have made his revision. Moreover, we reflect that S. Cyril as a follower of Meletius of Antioch was in close touch with the currents of theological thought there, and that it was to this Church that S. Athanasius addressed the famous letter which was, under God's Providence, the starting-point of a better understanding with the Semi-Arians, indeed of S. Cyril's own reconciliation with the Nicene party, and of the whole movement in the enlargement of creeds. These facts surely lead us to expect that S. Cyril, if he undertook any such enlargement, would turn to the Antiochian Creed for suggestions. This source would account for all the additions 'from heaven,' 'of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,' also 'crucified for us under Pontius Pilate,' 'again' (in Art. 8).

With reference to the change from 'sat' of the Old Jerusalem Creed to 'sitteth' and from 'in' to 'with (glory)' Dr. Gibson goes on to suggest: 'Now it seems improbable that these phrases would have been altered in a revision of the Creed. They are both Scriptural, and though it is easy to understand how Creeds would be enlarged by the *addition* of words and the insertion of new clauses, yet the minute *alteration* of phrases is another matter, and it can hardly be thought likely to have taken place.' He entirely overlooks the fact that S. Cyril in his teaching lays stress on each of these readings. So that we are positively led to expect such alterations from his pen if he revised the form.

In *Cat.*, xiv. 27, having quoted the Baptismal Creed with the reading 'sat,' he again and again speaks of the Son's 'sitting' as of eternal continuance, and condemns those 'Who falsely say that it was after His Cross and Resurrection and Ascension into heaven, that the Son began to sit on the right hand of the Father.'

In *Cat.*, xv. 3, after quoting the old Creed as '*in* glory,' he writes: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, then, comes from

[1] Bishop Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 45.

heaven; and He comes with glory at the end of this world, in the last day.'

But it is in regard to the third division of the Creed that Dr. Gibson thinks that Hort's theory seems completely to break down. He urges that, 'If the Creed of Jerusalem really lies at the basis of the enlarged Creed, then this part has been, not revised, but *rewritten* from beginning to end.' Apart, however, from the additional words about the Holy Ghost, which correspond to the additional section added from the first Nicene Creed in the second division, this section does not contain any new ideas. It is true that the order of the phrases about Baptism and the Holy Church has been reversed, but this is only one point in a process which must plainly be designated 'revision,' not 'rewriting.' Dr. Gibson omits to notice that 'resurrection of the dead,' substituted for 'resurrection of the flesh,' is in accordance with S. Cyril's expressed opinion, though he admits that S. Cyril employed such phrases and was bound to vary them in the course of his exposition. The truth is that he very strongly preferred one to the other.

Dr. Gibson suggests further that 'the correspondence between the Nicene and the enlarged Creed is closer if the Epiphanian and not the Chalcedonian form of the latter be taken for purposes of comparison.' It may be arbitrary to assume that the two slight variations in the form quoted by S. Epiphanius are due to carelessness on the part of S. Epiphanius or his copyists. But the fact remains that for this text of S. Epiphanius we are dependent on a single MS., so that Dr. Gibson's argument that 'there is no reason to suspect that the text has been tampered with' rests on an insecure foundation. And we know from the variety of versions current of the Chalcedonian form how tempting it was for copyists to assimilate texts, particularly by adding words from the first Nicene Creed which they might suppose had been omitted by mere accident. I fail therefore to see that Dr. Hort's argument has been in any degree shaken, though I wish to give the fullest consideration to Dr. Gibson's difficulties.

(3) *The Council of Constantinople*

The events which led up to the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381 are many of them obscure, and the Acts, or as we should say, the Minutes of the Council, have been lost. We have evidence, as will be shown presently, that at the Council of Chalcedon the revised Creed was quoted from the Acts, as composed or accepted by the holy Fathers at Constantinople. So we are justified in scrutinising the evidence to find out some reason for the acceptance of the Creed at the Council.

Nicene principles were spreading on all hands. In Rome an important series of Synods was held under Pope Damasus (A.D. 369-376). On the accession of the Emperor Theodosius, in A.D. 380, new hope came to all who remained true to the Nicene faith.

Theodosius convened a great Council at Constantinople, inviting Damasus to attend it with other Western Bishops. Possibly Theodosius had some idea of obtaining political support from Eastern Bishops by summoning the Council in the capital of the Eastern Empire. The Western Bishops would not come, and Damasus seems to have been badly advised about the trend of events in the East.

The Council met in May A.D. 381. There were present some 150 Bishops, who elected as their first President, Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, who had formerly been the leader of the Semi-Arian group of Bishops to which S. Cyril had belonged. This brought with it the triumphant vindication of Cyril's orthodoxy. Dr. Hort suggested that when charges were brought against S. Cyril he produced his Creed to prove his belief. He was defended by Gregory of Nyssa, to whom the Creed has been attributed. But there is no conclusive evidence that S. Cyril's orthodoxy was ever seriously impugned.

Unfortunately, when Meletius had settled the affairs of the Church in Constantinople, he died. Difficulties had arisen in connection with the installation of Gregory of Nazianzus as Bishop of Constantinople. He had been consecrated against his will, and went to Constantinople in

the days of Arian supremacy, and had been wonderfully successful in keeping the orthodox congregation together, being a man of sterling character and marvellous eloquence.

Not unnaturally he was chosen to succeed Meletius as President of the Council, but he was not a good chairman. Disputes arose at once about the succession of a bishop to the See of Antioch. When Meletius was still a Semi-Arian, a bishop had been consecrated to minister to the orthodox faithful in Antioch, Paulinus by name, whose claim was strongly supported by Pope Damasus. Gregory was himself of opinion that Paulinus should be recognised as true Bishop of Antioch. He pleaded with the Council that Paulinus was an old man, not likely to live long. By accepting his claim they would heal the schism and conciliate the Westerns. 'If it costs something let us make the sacrifice for the sake of a great religious gain.' But social feeling silenced counsels of peace. The younger bishops, whom S. Gregory bitterly compares to a flight of crows, to geese or cranes in a quarrel, to a whirlwind raising a cloud of dust, to a swarm of wasps darting against a traveller's face, insisted that to accept Paulinus would give a triumph to the West, whereas the East, where Christ appeared, had the right to ascendency. S. Gregory retorted that the East was the land where Christ was crucified! Such squabbles were undignified and could do no good.

Flavian was elected to be Bishop of Antioch, and consecrated at Antioch after the close of the Council. Then a personal attack was made on S. Gregory, on the ground of an obsolete canon which forbade the translation of a bishop from one see to another. As a matter of fact he had never acted as Bishop of Sasima, for which see he had been consecrated, nor had he ever held the see of Nazianzus, so the objection had little support on technical grounds. But it was sufficient to procure his resignation. In the brilliant sermon which he preached on the occasion he contrasted the present and the past position of Catholicism in the city. A little drop had swollen into a mighty stream. He ended with a peroration which even Gibbon calls 'pathetic and almost sub-

lime.' He bade farewell to the great Church of the Resurrection, to his Bishop's seat, the clergy, the members of religious communities, the widows, the orphans and the poor, the households which had tended his infirmities, the audiences which when he preached had crowded up to the chancel gates; here as Dr. Bright says, comes in a touch of self-complacency, 'to the emperor and the palace, and its train of servants,' whether faithful to their master or not, he did not profess to know, but he did know (here the rapier seems to flash out) that for the most part they were unfaithful to God: to the great Christian city whose citizens might well be urged to seek God more earnestly and more intelligently; to the East and to the West, in the cause of which and by which, he was alternately assailed, which he had striven to reconcile, which perhaps could be reconciled if others would imitate his abdication: "for those who quit their thrones do not lose their God, but will rather secure a higher throne in heaven." Finally, after bidding farewell to the "Angel guardians of this church," and praying that the Holy Trinity might be therein continually acknowledged and increasingly worshipped, he exhorted the people whom he tenderly described as still his own—"My dear children, keep, I pray you, the deposit; remember how I was stoned: the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all!"'[1]

His prayer was fulfilled in our Nicene Creed, which from the date of this Council has been known by the name of his see, a creed which in the Liturgy of the Church has done so much to promote worship of the Holy Trinity.

S. Gregory's successor was Nektarius, an elderly man, of good birth and pleasant manners but without training in theology, who had held the office of a Prætor, but at the time of his election was still unbaptized! His name seems to have been selected by the Emperor from a list supplied by the Bishops, possibly under the influence of Diodore of Tarsus. His early life had been stained by some immoralities, and there were protests against his

[1] W. Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 433.

election, but the majority approved it. His lax rule was a great contrast to that of the austere S. Gregory, and was not a success. But at the time it was acceptable. Having been baptized, he was consecrated in his white baptismal garments.

A most ingenious conjecture has been made by Dr. Kunze, that the revised Jerusalem Creed was used as his baptismal confession. The evidence on which it is based belongs to the history of the Council of Chalcedon and may be deferred for the moment.

The Council of Constantinople, meeting again under the presidency of Nektarius, reaffirmed the Creed of Nicæa and passed certain Canons. They also sent a letter to the Emperor with a record of their work.

The following year the Council reassembled, and sent a letter to Pope Damasus and others, in which they stated that for the proof of their orthodoxy it was sufficient for them to refer to the tome from Antioch, and to a similar formulary in which they have confirmed the Nicene faith and anathematised heresies, and also expanded the confession of faith. Dr. Bindley suggests that the first Canon exactly corresponds to the confirmation of the Nicene faith, and the anathematisation of heresies referred to, and that the more expanded confession of the faith may have been the revised Creed of Jerusalem.

The following year, A.D. 383, the Emperor Theodosius summoned a third Council, and demanded that different forms of Creed should be submitted to him. Only the Creed of Nektarius found favour.

At the Council of Ephesus in A.D. 430 the heretic Nestorius, who was on his trial, quoted the words of Art. 3 'incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary' as from the Nicene Creed, to the astonishment of S. Cyril of Alexandria, who quoted the correct form of the first Nicene Creed.[1]

Then the curtain falls until the Council of Chalcedon A.D. 451, when we find the Constantinopolitan Creed and the original Nicene Creed quoted side by side as the Creeds of the 150 holy Fathers and the 318 holy Fathers respectively.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 73.

At the first session one of the Bishops, Diogenes of Cyzicus, defended the text of the revised Creed as an addition to the Nicene Creed. The discussion about it was very protracted. When it grew dark wax candles were brought in, but did not prevent some disorder. At last the Imperial Commissioners asked all the Bishops to write down their creeds.

The Nicene Creed with its anathemas was read out by Eunomius, Bishop of Nicomedia. There was loud applause, the Bishops exclaiming: 'This is the faith of the orthodox, into this we were baptized, into this we baptize. S. Cyril (Bishop of Alexandria) believed this. Leo (Bishop of Rome) has interpreted thus.' Leo had sent a most important letter, commonly known as his Tome.

Then the Commissioners said: 'Let the things set out by the 150 holy Fathers be also read.' Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople read thus: 'The holy faith which the 150 Fathers set out agreeing with the holy and grand Synod in Nicæa.' Then followed the Constantinopolitan Creed. The Bishops cried out: 'This is the faith of all the orthodox. This we all believe.'

The Commissioners proposed a conference, which had important results in the revision of the text. At the sixth session the two Creeds were read again, and the text given of the *Constantinopolitanum* was that which we are led to connect with the text afterwards used in Rome. It does not seem imprudent to conjecture that it had been revised with the assistance of Leo's legate. On the other hand, the (presumably) Constantinopolitan text which Aetius had read at the second session is the text which we shall afterwards find carried over from Constantinople to Spain.

Now we come to the extraordinarily interesting evidence on which Dr. Kunze's theory about the Creed is based.[1] At the end of the Council all the Bishops signed their names to its decrees with little notes. One of them Kallinikus, Bishop of Apamea (=Myrlea) in Bithynia accepting the Creeds as the symbols of the 318 and 150 Fathers, referred to the Council of Constantinople as having been held at the ordination of the

[1] *Das Nicänisch—Konstantinopolitanische Symbol*, p. 35.

most pious Nektarius the Bishop. Obviously there was some connection in his mind between the Creed and the consecration of Nektarius as Bishop. Probably it was the Creed which he had professed at his baptism, and it became the Baptismal Creed of his city.

There is some further evidence. A certain officer of the imperial service in Constantinople, Nilus by name, who came from Ancyra in Galatia, and afterwards went to live as a monk on Mount Sinai, seems to have quoted this form of Creed.

The priest Proclus, who opposed Nestorius, is supposed to show acquaintance with the Creed in the words:—'Lo, the Holy Ghost is worshipped with the Father and the Son.' This is slight evidence in itself, but is worthy of consideration taken with other possible quotations, *e.g.* by Mark the hermit, who lived at Ancyra, and was a pupil of S. Chrysostom.

Certainly this is the direction in which future research must work.

(4) *Introduction into the Liturgy*

We have traced the revised Creed from its original home in Jerusalem to its adopted home in Constantinople. Yet another chapter in its romantic history is opened. It had been in Ante-Nicene times an instruction in the faith for catechumens. In the fourth century it became also a guarantee of orthodoxy. It next became the doxology of the faith in the Liturgy. 'To this position,' as Mr. Turner has well said, 'no other form of Creed ever aspired than that of Constantinople. Alike in the Greek, the Latin, and even the Coptic Churches, its majestic rhythm and its definite but simple and straightforward theology have marked it out as the Creed of Christian worship.'

Theodore the Reader, in his *Church History* (about 520 A.D.) tells us that Peter the Fuller, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch from 476 to 488, devised the saying of the Creed at every service, and again that Timothy of Constantinople (512-517), another Monophysite, 'ordered that the Symbol of the Faith of the 318 Fathers should

be said at every service, as an insinuation that Macedonius [his orthodox predecessor] did not accept the Creed, for it had formerly been said only once a year, on the occasion of the catechetical instructions given by the bishop on Good Friday.'[1]

Reading between the lines, we can see that the Monophysites, who clung to the idea that in the One Christ there was only one Nature, took up and used the Creed in this way as a protest against the Definition of Faith put forward at the Council of Chalcedon, in which the doctrine of the Two Natures had been very beautifully and very explicitly stated.

Mr. Turner quotes a 'curious narrative which has been embedded among the acts of the Council of Constantinople held by the patriarch Mennas in 536. Timothy the Monophysite patriarch died in 517; Anastasius the Monophysite emperor on July 9, 518. The new emperor Justin was an adherent of the Chalcedonian. Definition, and the new patriarch John, it was supposed, had only anathematised it under compulsion.' On Monday, July 16, 518, a solemn celebration was held in the cathedral in honour of the Fourth Council. 'The patriarch on his entrance was greeted with fresh demands for the insertion into the church diptychs of the memorial of the orthodox patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius, as well as of Pope Leo; satisfied again on this head, the congregation broke out "for a good hour" into antiphonal singing of the *Benedictus*. At last the service was allowed to proceed, and the choir began the *Trisagion*: "and after the reading of the holy Gospel, the divine liturgy taking its usual course and the doors having been closed, *and the holy instruction* (*μάθημα, i.e.* the Creed) *having been recited according to custom*, at the moment of the diptychs the whole multitude quietly gathered round the sanctuary and listened; and when only the names of the aforesaid four Holy Synods were mentioned by the deacon, and those of the archbishops of holy memory, Euphemius, Macedonius and Leo, all with a loud voice cried out, "Glory be to Thee, O

[1] Theodorus Lector, *H.E.*, ii. fragments 48 and 32.

Lord." And after this the divine liturgy was completed with all orderliness.'[1]

When Theodore speaks of the 'Creed of the 318 Fathers' there can be little doubt that he is speaking of the Constantinopolitan Creed regarded as an improved recension of the original Nicene Creed. Theodore, as we have seen, identified it with the Creed used in catechising, and no trace of the first Nicene Creed has been found in the Greek liturgies. We have also seen how confusion arose between the two forms at the Council of Chalcedon. At the general Council of 553 the Emperor Justinian accepted it officially as of coequal authority with the first Creed: 'The holy Fathers at Chalcedon anathematised those who have propounded or propound another Creed than that which was put out by the 318 holy Fathers and explained by the 150 holy Fathers.'[2] The symbol or 'mathema' of the Faith was originally confessed at Nicæa against the Arian impiety: but the teaching of Macedonius on the Holy Spirit, and of Apollinaris on the Incarnation, led the Fathers of Constantinople, while following 'the right faith put forward by the 318,' to 'give explanations about the Divinity of the Holy Spirit,' and to 'teach perfectly about the dispensation of the Incarnate Word.'[3] In Mr. Turner's words: 'It is clear that the longer Creed is regarded as a legitimate and necessary expansion of the shorter; in other words, the Constantinopolitan is the completed form of the Nicene Creed.' In Constantinople there was no need to preserve the independent existence of the first Nicene Creed; but in the West the tradition of its history survived, and we find it preserving a comparatively pure text in Collections of Councils, although it was the *Constantinopolitanum* that ultimately came into the Liturgy of the Western Church.

In the seventh century Isidore of Seville fell into the same mistake. He calls the liturgical Creed by the name Nicene: 'The Creed which is proclaimed by the people at the time of the sacrifice was edited at the Nicene

[1] C. H. Turner, *Op. cit.*, p. 48.
[2] Labbe-Coleti, *Concilia*, vi. 20, 21.
[3] *Ibid.*; *vide* C. H. Turner, *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

Synod by the collating of the 318 holy Fathers.' That he meant the *Constantinopolitanum* is proved by references in the eighth and twelfth Councils of Toledo A.D. 653, 681, where the Creed 'as it is proclaimed in the solemnities of the Mass' is transcribed in full.

We must now turn to the subsequent history of the Creed in the Western Liturgy, which is mainly concerned with the addition of the words 'And the Son.' But it is necessary also to take account of the addition 'God of God.'

The words 'God of God' stood in the original Creed of Cæsarea as quoted by Eusebius at Nicæa, and came into the Creed of the Council. They were not included by S. Cyril in his revision of the Jerusalem Creed, but without any dogmatic purpose, since they are implied in the words 'true God of true God.' At Chalcedon they appear in the form quoted at the second Session by Aetius, presumably as the text used in the Church of Constantinople, and came naturally into the form used by the Spanish Church as we shall see presently. But they do not occur in the text quoted at the sixth Session of the Council of Chalcedon.

I may sum up the conclusions which we have thus far reached in the eloquent words of Mr. Turner:

'The Creed of Constantinople did not merely make its way into other baptismal rites than those of its original home at Jerusalem and its adopted home at Constantinople. Its real significance in history lies in a different direction altogether. If the Apostles' Creed is inalienably associated with the initial stages of the Christian life as part of the preparation for the Sacrament of Baptism, the Constantinopolitan Creed has acquired an equally organic connection with the fullest expression of Christian life in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.'[1]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

CHAPTER III

THE LATER HISTORY OF OUR NICENE CREED

It has been assumed, somewhat too hastily, in many modern text-books that the last scene in the history of our Nicene Creed was enacted at the famous Council of Toledo in A.D. 589. The ancient town walls of Toledo which frown down on the waters of the Tagus as they dash under the old bridge, date back in part beyond the invasion of the Moors to the days of the Visigothic supremacy. Never have men passed within them to a more striking scene than the memorable Council at which King Reccared, in the name of his nation, and in the presence of his chief councillors, together with all the Bishops of the Catholic Church within his dominions, abjured the heresy of Arianism which had been hereditary in his race, and accepted the Nicene Creed as the true standard of primitive Christian doctrine. He introduced into his address part of the Definition of Chalcedon, and then subscribed it with the words: 'I, King Reccared, have subscribed this holy faith and this true confession, which alone the Catholic Church through the whole globe professes.'

The Queen followed his example, and some ten Bishops witnessed their subscription with expressions of thankfulness. The Bishops then met in Synod and agreed on some twenty-three anathemas for the preservation of true doctrine, and some Canons, one of which must be quoted in full:—

'For the increase of the Faith and to strengthen the minds of men, it is ordered by the Synod, at the advice of Reccared, that in all the Churches of Spain and Gallicia, following the form of the Oriental Churches, the Symbol of the Faith of the Council of Constantinople, that is of the one hundred and fifty bishops, shall be recited; so that before the Lord's Prayer is said the Creed

shall be chanted with a clear voice by the people ; that testimony may thus be borne to the true faith, and that the hearts of the people may come purified by the faith to taste the Body and Blood of Christ.'

One of the leading theologians at the Council, John of Biclaro, Bishop of Gerona, had recently returned from Constantinople, where he had resided for some years. It was no doubt due to his influence that the liturgical use of the Creed was introduced, according to the custom at Constantinople. Moreover the text of the Creed itself in the Acts of the Council follows closely the form quoted at the second Session of the Council of Chalcedon, which we found reason to regard as the form currently used in the Church of Constantinople.[1]

These considerations render it in the highest degree improbable that the Council could have accepted the interpolation of the words 'And the Son' in Art. 9 without protest from a prelate who was qualified to speak with authority on the text used by the Eastern Church, the example of which they all evidently wished to copy.

In my *Introduction to the Creeds*[2] I quoted the fact that two early editions of the Councils—Cologne (1530) and Paris (1535)—omit the words in the text of the Creed as quoted at Toledo. Indeed Cardinal d'Aguirre admits that some MSS. do not contain them. I am now able to produce evidence,[3] from some of the most important MSS. of the Spanish Councils at the Escurial and at Madrid, which confirms my conviction that the Council never added the words at all. Some MSS. omit them altogether, an omission which would not be made intentionally after controversy had arisen with the Eastern Church in the ninth century. Some MSS. put them into the margin or between the lines. When the Creed occurs twice, first under the heading Constantinople, and then under the heading Toledo, it is always under the heading Toledo that the words creep in, before they are added in the other text-form. The reason is not far to seek. The copyist has read in one of the anathemas of

[1] *E.g.* it includes the words 'God of God,' in Art. 2. [2] P. 115.
[3] I have published it in a note in the *Journal of Theol. Studies*, Jan. 1908.

this Council of Toledo: 'Whoever does not believe or has not believed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and has not said that He is coeternal and coessential with the Father and the Son, let him be anathema.' With that fate hanging over his head what was a poor copyist to do? Without larger knowledge he could not imagine that the Creed had not contained the words 'And the Son' from the beginning. We cannot blame him. When the words once crept into the Toledan text it was natural that they should spread into the form quoted as from the Council of Constantinople. The Creed thus interpolated spread.

At first sight it seems somewhat illogical that the Council of Toledo should lay such stress on the point, and yet keep the Creed text pure. But we must remember that there were other points in their anathema, such as the assertion of the coessentiality and coeternity of the Holy Spirit, which to them were equally important, yet neither of them were explicitly asserted in the Creed. As in so many cases, it has happened that the progress of error since the making of the Creed has rendered further dogmatic definition necessary for clear interpretation of the fundamental truths which the Creed in its simplicity protects. If the Holy Ghost is worshipped with the Father and the Son, such honour can only be rightly paid on the ground that He is coessential and coequal, as the Son has been acknowledged to be at the cost of the long Arian controversy. Therefore the Toledan Fathers were only drawing out what seemed to them latent in the Creed.

As regards the Procession from the Son they were loyal to the earlier teaching of their Church. A Council of Toledo in A.D. 447 had adopted the Canon: 'The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Paraclete not begotten but proceeding from the Father and the Son.' The latter phrase occurs twice. Dr. Neale suggests that the Spanish Church in its continual controversy with Arianism, shrank from the idea that the Father had an attribute which the Son had not.[1] But it is more probable that without much reflection they were simply

[1] *Hist. Eastern Church*, Introd. ii. 115. 3.

loyal to what had been a marked characteristic of Western teaching since the time of S. Augustine. It is important to make this fact quite plain. Eastern and Western thinkers started from two different points of view. Therein lies the justification for the age-long quarrel on this subject, which can never be composed until justice is done to the sincerity of both parties.

The liturgical use of the Creed spread far and wide. Among the Metropolitans who subscribed the Acts of the Council was Migetius, Metropolitan of Narbonne, Bishop of the province of Gaul. The province of Narbonne was a constituent part of the Visigothic kingdom which extended as far as the Rhone. At the beginning of the seventh century there were sees established at Saragossa, Barcelona, Gerona. In the following century the kingdom of Charles the Great, extended southward to Barcelona, so that even if the interpolated Creed had not penetrated to Narbonne in the previous century, it might well have come from Barcelona into Gaul.

(1) *The Controversy*

The addition of the words 'And the Son' did not begin to attract notice until the end of the eighth century. At the Council of Gentilly in A.D. 767—so we are informed by the Chronicler Ado of Vienne—the question was ventilated between the Greeks and the Romans about the Trinity, and whether the Holy Spirit so proceeds from the Son as He proceeds from the Father. Some ambassadors of the Eastern Emperor Constantine Copronymus were present and remonstrated. We hear no more until A.D. 787, when Charles the Great remonstrated with Pope Hadrian because he accepted the Creed of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in which the words occur :—'I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father through the Son, and Himself both is and is acknowledged as God.' Charles quoted the interpolated Nicene Creed. Hadrian answered that Tarasius relied on the teaching of the Holy Fathers, quoting S. Athanasius, S. Eusebius, S. Hilary and others. The passages are not

all to the point, and it is remarkable that the Pope did not reply to the King's appeal to the Nicene Creed. Because he dared not? More probably because he was puzzled by the evidence of the MSS.

At the Council of Friuli, under Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, in A.D. 791, the interpolation was defended, and a letter was sent by Paulinus to the K ng in which occurs the following passage:

'For if the venerable compilation of the Nicene Symbol be examined, nothing else will be found to be set forth therein concerning the Holy Ghost than this. "They say: "*And in the Holy Ghost.*" . . . How is this so very brief profession of theirs to be received except that there is given us to understand the religious devotion of the pure faith of their minds, and that they believed, as is most likely in the Holy Ghost, just as in the Father and in the Son; as afterwards was done by the 150 holy Fathers, who testified that the faith of the Symbol of the Nicene Council should remain for ever inviolate. Yet, as if for expounding the meaning of their predecessors, they made additions, and confess that they believe "*in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father,*" . . . for these words and the rest that follow are not contained in the sacred dogma of the Nicene Symbol. But afterwards too, on account forsooth of these heretics who whisper that the Holy Spirit is of the Father alone, and proceeds from the Father alone, there was added—"*who proceedeth from the Father and the Son.*" And yet these holy Fathers are not to be blamed, as if they had added anything to, or taken anything away from the faith of the 318 Fathers, who had no thought on divine subjects contrary to their meaning, but in an honest manner studied to complete their sense without spoiling it.'

The weak point in this argument is that Paulinus could not quote another Council of authority as supplementing the Creed of Constantinople by this addition.

While the matter was thus simmering in the minds of the theologians at the court of Charles the Great, a new turn was given to the discussion by a letter which certain Latin monks who were living on Mount Olivet, and others who were living at Bethlehem, sent home to the Pope. Both at Jerusalem and at Bethlehem they were accused by a certain monk, called John, of heresy, because they sang the interpolated Creed on Christmas Day. So they sent one of their number to ask the Pope what they should do, and requested him to inform the

Emperor. They urged that they had heard the Creed sung with these words in the Emperor's chapel, and that such teaching was given in a homily of S. Gregory, and in the Rule of S. Benedict, MSS. which had been given to them by the Emperor; also in a dialogue of S. Benedict which the Pope had given to them, and in the Athanasian Creed.

No direct reply from the Pope has come down to us, but there is a profession of faith, which may have been included in his answer—'Leo to all the churches of the East.' It is a clear expression of the doctrine of the Roman Church, and contains a definite statement of the Procession from the Son.

Leo sent a formal letter to the Emperor, who at once summoned the Bishops to meet him at Aix. They were unanimous in upholding the doctrine. As regarding the interpolation in the Creed, they felt that the matter required delicate handling. The Pope said nothing about it, and they knew that the practice of the Roman Church differed from their own as to the use of the Creed in the Liturgy. So they decided to send a mission to the Pope, consisting, according to Eginhard (the Emperor's secretary), of Bernhard, Bishop of Worms, and Adalhard, Abbot of Corbie. Petavius says that he found mention in some old acts of the conference, of Jesse, the Bishop of Orleans, the neighbour and diocesan of Adalhard, who is the more likely to have been added to the mission because he had been sent by Charles on a political mission to Constantinople in A.D. 802.

A most interesting account of the conference which was held between the Pope and these legates in the Secretarium of St. Peter's, has been preserved by the Abbot Smaragdus. The Pope readily assented to the doctrine as stated by the Council of Aix, and agreed with them that wilful rejection of it was heresy. But he declined to assert that acceptance of the doctrine was in all cases necessary to salvation, and he resolutely refused to insert the words in the Creed. The legates pleaded that thousands of souls had gained their knowledge of the truth by hearing the interpolated words sung in the Creed at Mass, and that the Pope himself

had given them leave to sing the Creed. He retorted that he had not given them leave to add anything to, or take anything away from the text. The Roman Church had not presumed to add anything to the ancient Creed even when it seemed to need expansion. The legates finally pointed out that to cut out words which had been regarded as part of the Faith would bring danger to simple souls. The Pope admitted this, and advised that they should gradually give up singing the Creed at Mass. They could then cut out the words without exciting much attention. The true doctrine would still be held, as it was held in Rome, where the Creed was only used in the instruction of catechumens.

No attempt seems to have been made to renew negotiations. The Pope, 'fearless and wise,' as Dr. Swete well says, was determined to guard the Roman Church against unwarranted interpolations in the Creed. The librarian Anastasius in his life of Leo III. in the *Liber Pontificalis* records that for his love of the orthodox faith and for greater caution he made two shields of silver, each inscribed with the Creed, the one in Greek letters, the other in Latin, on the right hand and on the left over the entrance 'of the Confession, or shrine, in St. Peter's.'[1] Later writers differ as to details. Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, says that Leo found these shields in the treasury at St. Peter's, and put them up on the doors of the church, not in the Confession. But all agree that Leo put up an uninterpolated text. His prudence, however, did not arrest the catastrophe of a controversy with the Eastern Church, which before fifty years had passed was fanned into a flame by Photius.

The Emperor Charles and his theologians continued to use the interpolated Creed, which spread far and wide over his Empire, and a crop of theological treatises sprang up in defence of the doctrine. But it was not until two centuries had passed that the custom of singing the Creed in the Liturgy was adopted in Rome, when in A.D. 1014 the Emperor Henry II. prevailed on Benedict VIII. to adopt the common use of chanting the Symbol at the Holy

[1] Ed. Duchesne, ii. 26.

Mysteries, and with it came the use of the interpolated Creed.

Mr. Turner has dealt concisely with the difficulty that certain Gallican writers of the ninth century make, or appear to make, statements to the contrary, viz. to the effect that the Creed was used in the Liturgy in Rome. 'We have just got to explain them away. Thus when Amalarius of Trèves includes in his *Comments on the Ordo Romanus* a mention of the Creed, we must suppose what is easy enough, that he is commenting on the Ordo Romanus as used in Gaul. And when Walafrid writes that the liturgical use of the Creed 'is believed to have come from the East to Rome,' and so to Gaul, this represents what Charles and his Frankish theologians wanted to be true, and on *a priori* grounds believed to be true, rather than what was true in fact.'[1]

This Walafrid Strabo was Abbot of Reichenau, *c.* A.D. 850, and tells us that the custom of singing the Creed became more popular in the Gallican and German Churches at the time of the Adoptionist controversy. This is probably true. The treatise of the Italian Bishops against the Adoptionist Elipandus, published in 794, contains very strong statements on the doctrine of the Procession from the Son. Walafrid gives two reasons, as Mr. Turner says, both sound in their way, to explain why it was the *Constantinopolitanum* and not the *Nicænum* which was used, namely, that the former was perhaps easier to sing, and that it had ousted the latter owing to the local patriotism of the people of Constantinople.

(2) *Later history*

It remains to trace the history of the revised Constantinopolitan text, our Nicene Creed, in the Service books of the Celtic and Saxon Churches, and of its translation into English at the time of the Reformation.

British bishops attended the Council of Arles in A.D. 314, and were summoned to the Council of Nicæa, from which they excused themselves on the ground of distance and poverty. The earliest texts of the Creed of the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

Council would penetrate into Britain through Gaul. Thus we find a Creed, which combines characteristics of the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, in the Bangor Antiphonary of the sixth century. But we must wait until the ninth century before we come upon the text of the *Constantinopolitanum*. Probably the Stowe Missal is the earliest representative, and I will quote its text in the Appendix.[1]

This is one of the earliest remaining service books of the Irish Church, and contains an uninterpolated text, the words *Filioque* having been added by a later hand in the margin. The question of its witness to the introduction of the Creed into the Irish liturgy is still in dispute. But the forthcoming edition, which Dr. G. F. Warner is editing for the Bradshaw Society, will no doubt supply materials for a final judgment on the question.

The variations in the Latin text current in England during the Middle Ages have never been investigated. The use of the Creed in the Liturgy was common certainly from the tenth century.

The first translation of the Nicene Creed into English appears to have been made by Archbishop Cranmer in one of his first experiments in translation of the Mass, and was published in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

The first draft is found in a MS. in the British Museum,[2] and the text differs from that found in the First Prayer Book only in small details.[3] It did not include the words 'whose kingdom shall have no end.' Bishop Dowden has shown that the omission was deliberate, as a result of critical investigation, but that Cranmer found that he had been mistaken and restored the words in the Second Prayer Book.

Bishop Gibson suggests that Cranmer inserted 'I believe' before 'one catholic and apostolic church' to make a distinction between believing *in* the Holy Ghost and believing the Catholic Church, *i.e.* believing that there is such a Catholic Church. Rufinus and other Latin writers

[1] P. 114.

[2] Brit. Mus. MS. 34191 W. H. Frere in *J. T. S.*, i. p. 232.

[3] 'And was crucified for us': 'to judge the quycke': 'which spake by the prophets.'

often draw this distinction between believing *in* Divine Persons and believing about their work in the Church or in the remission of sins, etc. Cranmer himself in his *Annotations upon the King's Book* writes, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost, and that there is a holy Catholic Church.'[1]

That he should insert the word 'holy' when quoting from the Apostles' Creed, makes it more noticeable that he omits the word in the Nicene Creed. There can be no question that this was due to the omission of the word in the texts of the Creed given in early editions of the Councils, which he consulted. We are now in a position to prove that the omission was characteristic of the old Latin text both of Spain and Rome, and also, apparently, of the text used in the Church of Constantinople. Why it should thus differ from the text of the Jerusalem Creed of S. Cyril, and the Creed of S. Epiphanius, has not yet been discovered. The Reformers followed the best text which they could find, but the omisson is none the less to be regretted, since 'holy' was a note of the Church in the Baptismal Creed from the earliest times.

The practical importance of the doctrine which has thus been incorporated in the Liturgy and Articles of our Church will come before us again. We are now concerned only with the history of the form of the Creed used. We have traced its evolution from its first beginning until the present day. As I have said elsewhere, 'The faith of the Nicene Council is related to our Nicene Creed as a bud from a garden-rose to the wild-rose stock into which it is grafted. The rose-grower with cunning hand unites the beauty of colour and form which he has cultivated to the hardy nature and vigorous growth of the wild plant. Our Nicene Creed is the old Baptismal Creed of Jerusalem revised by the insertion of Nicene theological terms. Thus the improved theology was grafted into the stock of the old historic faith.'[2] We may thank God that the genius of a great Catechist has given us in the Creed of our Eucharistic worship one fitted, alike by its rhythm and by the proportion in its theological teaching, to be a liturgical treasure for all Christendom.

[1] Gibson, *Op. cit.*, p. 175. [2] *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 98.

PART II.—THE THEOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

ANTE-NICENE THEOLOGY

THERE are two main lines of attack upon the Nicene Creed: *First*, It is maintained that a dogmatic Creed has been set in the foreground of Christian teaching where Christ set not a Creed but a Sermon. *Secondly*, It is said that the Greek metaphysical terms introduced into the Creed mar the simplicity of the plain Bible teaching which it would otherwise share with other ancient forms of the Apostles' Creed. In the first case it is said that we sacrifice the claims of conscience to the supposed interests of reason; in the second, so it is alleged, we are challenged to decide between credulity and commonsense.

(*a*) Theology must at all costs preserve the delicate balance between the demands of Reason and Conscience. It was the supreme merit of S. Athanasius that he saw this need, and laboured unflinchingly to preserve it. Like S. Paul he gave most weight to conscience. Christianity is the imitation of Christ's perfect life, the endeavour to live more and more strenuously according to the pattern set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. But the moral effort demanded is so great, the price to be paid for allegiance to such a Master is so costly, that the question must arise, 'By what authority did the Prophet of Nazareth teach such things and make such demands on conscience?' The whole drift of His teaching led men to ask the question, which at last under the most solemn circumstances He put to the Apostles, when events were shaping towards a crisis in the history of

His mission to His people, 'Whom say ye that I am?' The answer of the Apostles, 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God' was the only possible answer which could satisfy One who claimed to speak with an authority superior to that of Moses or the Prophets. If He was not God He was not good. There is no escape from the old dilemma. It presents itself to the minds of succeeding generations in many different forms, but the question can never be settled otherwise than on the lines which S. Athanasius, as the foremost apologist of the Nicene Council, has laid down. When we believe in Christ, we yield to the attraction of a Personality which has through all the centuries won the allegiance of countless hearts who can say with S. Paul, 'The life that I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me.' They are conscious of a mystical union through which their character is remade, their conscience strengthened, their whole outlook on life widened. Their faith becomes invincible. However imperfectly words may express their gratitude, it is plain that no confession short of the fullest acknowledgment of Christ's Lordship, of Christ's Divinity, can justify their instinctive desire to worship Him. Any compromise with regard to this acknowledgment, the Arian or any other, leads to nothing else than idolatry or the rejection of Christ. Thus S. Athanasius defended the main thesis of the Nicene Creed, which is a legitimate and reasonable conclusion built up on the practice of the Apostles, whom the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount led to worship the Preacher. Thus the first line of attack, the false antithesis in which the Nicene Creed is put to the Sermon on the Mount, breaks down. No one who has not tested the value of his creed in life, in the hour of temptation, when his will is weak, when all the fine array of intellectual arguments is endangered by the onset of passion, when pride and prejudice sweep away the last remnants of the ordered resistance of his faculties to fierce anger and bitter words, and only the feeble cry of a tottering conscience to 'Jesus Christ' has availed to turn defeat into victory,—has any right to criticise in the study the

terms in which on the battle-field of life Christians express their love to Him in whom they are more than conquerors.

(*b*) The second line of attack insists that Greek metaphysical terms have corrupted the teaching of the Bible and are unsuited to the present day. This attack is more difficult to meet than the first, because it cannot be denied that our modes of thought differ widely from those of the fourth century, and no one in his senses would assert that human thought has not progressed. At first, therefore, the contention that Greek metaphysical terms are out of date in Christian creeds seems reasonable. But on second thoughts we perceive that there is a much more important problem involved than the mere question of the history of certain Greek philosophical terms. As Dr. Strong has put it with regard to the famous term *Homo-ousios*: 'This also requires translation; it must be expressed in the language in which we think. But it is the formal definition of the Church of one age, continually accepted by successive ages, of the Catholic belief as to the nature of the Son. It expresses the conviction that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. We may translate this into any *language* we like, but we cannot explain it away without a total departure from the ancient faith of Christendom. To say, therefore, that it has only a historic interest, as representing the point of view of that day, does not quite correspond with the facts. It is the Nicene form given to the thought that Christ is Son of God, just as ὁμοούσιον is the Greek word expressed in English by the phrase 'of one substance.' The real matter is one of fact, of truth or falsity, and not of expression merely.'[1] We turn then to the subject of Ante-Nicene Theology to watch the development of ideas which the Nicene terms systematised but did not create.

(1) *New Testament Theology*

It is needless to say that the writers of the New Testament assumed the existence of God, and taught the

[1] *Manual of Theology*, Black, p. 198.

doctrine of the creation of the world by God as they had learnt it from the Jewish Scriptures. This became a burning question when the Gnostics came on the horizon. It is probably due to the pressure of such error that the Eastern Creeds included a reference to the creation of all things visible and invisible by the Almighty Father. And it is precisely in this conception of God as Father, that the teaching of the New Testament is original. The idea was not new, but it was the teaching of Jesus which had made it 'current coin,' and had filled it with new meaning. To former teachers God was Father of Israel and Israelites,[1] but they allowed only limited range to this ideal, and knew not how to combine it with the idea of God as Creator and Sustainer of the universe. On the other hand, in His Sermon on the Mount the Lord Jesus moved naturally as it were in these highest realms of thought. His Father was their Father also, loving even to the unthankful and evil, as He gives rain both to the just and the unjust, and cares for the little birds and flowers, so that nothing that He has made is beyond the range of His interest and His Providence.[2] Only upon such teaching could be raised the strong foundations of the teaching of S. John, inspired teaching which is the very charter of free Christian thought, 'God is Love.'[3] And it was the beloved disciple who proclaimed also that 'God is Light,'[4] so that the Son of God comes into the world *as* light into darkness to dispel the shadows of error and evil, and again, 'God is a Spirit,'[5] so that true religion must always teach worship in spirit and in truth. This principle is enough to guard the conception that Sacraments are, in Hooker's phrase, moral, not mechanical means of grace. The two chief Sacraments of the Gospel were valued by the early Christians as means of grace which enabled them to walk in the steps of their Lord, to reproduce His example, to grow after His likeness. But they followed this aim always with a moral purpose. And there is no question about the reason. They had always in their thoughts the belief

[1] *Cf.* Deut. i. 31; Ps. ciii. 13; Jer. iii. 4, 19; Is. lxiii. 16; lxiv. 8.
[2] Matt. v. 45; vi. 26; x. 29.
[3] 1 John iv. 8.
[4] 1 John i. 5.
[5] John iv. 24.

that they were being led by His Spirit, that the outpouring of Pentecost was a continuous possession and a perpetual privilege. Baptized into His death and risen with Him to newness of life, sustained by the communion of His Body and Blood, they could walk in the Spirit, they could 'crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts,' they could set an example of devotion to duty and of loving self-sacrifice such as the world had not dreamed of.

My point is simply this, that New Testament theology must be summed up on the line of thought mapped out by the ancient Creeds, Western and Eastern alike. In Christ men reached a new conception of the Fatherhood of God, on which to base their ideal of the brotherhood of man, and their vivid experience of the comfort and joy of the Holy Ghost, who first taught them to say 'Jesus is the Lord,' led them through days of trouble and rebuke as a shady cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night.

It is easy for faddists to find support in isolated texts for any new scheme of doctrine, or theory of ethics. What they cannot do is to point to successive periods of Church history in which their fine-spun schemes and theories successfully stood the strain of testing in social life. But this is just what the Church can do while we are loyal to our creeds. At crisis after crisis we can observe the great leaders, true to the old faith, nor trusting it in vain.

To take one example—in the year 252 A.D. When the plague was ravaging Carthage, Bishop Cyprian summoned the Christians to pray and work for their persecutors. He appealed to their Christian belief in their veritable sonship to God. They responded nobly, raised a sufficient fund of money, 'and formed an adequate staff for the nursing and burial of sufferers and victims without any discrimination of religious profession.'[1]

[1] Archbishop Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 245. He continues: 'Of this organisation probably little or nothing transpired before the heathen. We see to-day how the wide organisations, much more the self-sacrifice, of the Church's work in obscure London, can escape the philanthropic novelist and even the religious sects of more prosperous quarters. The slow, vast effect of those unsuspected forces on Carthage may cheer the sacrificers and organisers of to-day.'

Five years later he was banished. This, says his biographer, 'was his reward for withdrawing from living sight a horror like that of hell,' and for 'saving his country from becoming the empty shell of an exiled population.'

This is an example which should appeal to us of the twentieth century, who talk so much, whether we care or not, about schemes for social reforms. We need not add a word in disparagement of the self-sacrifice of scientist or philanthropist, who is unable to acknowledge with us the glory of the Eternal Trinity or the Divinity of our Lord. We only claim as our proudest boast that there have never been lacking volunteers for any work of mercy whose inspiration has come from our Creed, and that such love, self-forgetting, humble, loyal to comrades, unbelievers as well as believers, is the supreme test of its truth.

(2) *The Apostolic Fathers*

The most important for our purpose of those writers is Ignatius, the martyr Bishop of Antioch. In Lightfoot's words, his letters teach 'a theology wonderfully mature in spite of its immaturity.' Ignatius in his teaching on the Trinity continues the Pauline teaching of 2 Cor. xiii. 13, that through the Son is the way to the Father, and that union with the Father through the Son is a communion in the Spirit. Again and again he reiterates his testimony to the historic faith as we find it outlined from the days of the Apostles in the Baptismal Creeds.

Thus to the Trallians he writes, *e.g.* : 'Be ye deaf, therefore, when any man speaketh to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, who was the Son of Mary, who was truly born and ate and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and those on earth and those under the earth ; who, moreover, was truly raised from the dead, His Father having raised Him, who in the like fashion will so raise us also who believe on Him—His Father I say, will raise us—in Christ Jesus, apart from whom we have not true life.'

In his teaching on the Person of Christ Ignatius goes further than the oldest Baptismal Creeds, he may even be said to anticipate S. Athanasius by his clear-cut antitheses (*ad Eph.*, 7): 'There is one only physician, of flesh and of spirit, begotten and unbegotten, God in man, true Life in death, Son of Mary and Son of God, first passible (=capable of suffering) and then impassible (=incapable of suffering), Jesus Christ our Lord.'[1]

There might be justification for questioning whether these words tend in an heretical direction, if Ignatius had not made it quite plain that he believed in the pre-existence of the Son. He speaks of Jesus Christ 'who was before the ages with the Father and in the end appeared.'[2] But the conception of the eternal Generation of the Son had not yet found clear expression in Christian thought.

Clement of Rome writes, without reference to a Creed but on the same lines: 'Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace, which was poured out upon us.'[3] . . . 'As God lives and the Lord Jesus Christ lives, and the Holy Spirit the faith and hope of the elect.'[4]

The teaching of Hermas, a prophet of the Church in Rome, in his allegory *The Shepherd*, is less decisive. It was at one time cited as Scripture by some churches, but was silently rejected in the final shaping of the New Testament Canon. The autobiographical details which it supplies are full of interest. Hermas was an obscure, probably second-rate shopkeeper in Rome at the beginning of the second century. In spite of many failures he tried to keep honest, and to speak the truth. He had many disappointments in his business and in his home, and yet he tried to keep cheerful. There is something pathetic about his confessions of the double-mindedness which injured his business, and the quick temper which marred the peace of his home. Both, he says, 'grieve the Holy Spirit.' 'Therefore, remove sorrow from thy heart and afflict not the Holy Spirit

[1] *Eph.*, 7.
[2] *Magn.*, 6.
[3] 1 *Cor.*, xlvi. 6.
[4] *Ibid.*, lviii. 2.

which dwelleth in thee lest He make intercession against thee with God and depart from thee.'[1]

As Dr. Orr has shown: 'With regard to Christ himself there seems little doubt that Hermas meant to assert a true incarnation of the pre-existent Son. In one place, for instance, Hermas is shown a rock and a gate, and is told that they denote the Son of God. How, he asks, can this be, seeing that the rock is old and the gate new? It is replied—The Son of God is more ancient than all creation, and became the Father's counsellor in His creation. For this reason He is old But the gate is new, because He was made manifest in the last days, that they who are to be saved may enter through it into the Kingdom of God.'[2]

We can maintain that Hermas believed rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, while we acknowledge that he made serious mistakes when attempting to explain the relation of the Lord to the Holy Spirit. What opportunities had such a man, struggling against a spirit of indecision to confess the Lord whole-heartedly even in suffering,[3] to perfect himself in the precise use of theological terms? Dr. Harnack has relied on precarious foundations when he endeavours to prove from the mistakes of Hermas that there were two strains of Christian teaching about the Person of Christ at this period, that beside the teaching of Clement and Ignatius as to a Spiritual Being who has become incarnate, there was another line of thought in which Jesus was regarded as a man in whom the Spirit of God dwelt, who was adopted after probation by God as His Son.

It was the task of wiser men than Hermas to reflect on the deeper meaning of the Christian tradition, and to interpret it to cultured minds. The teaching of S. John on the Logos, the Divine Word, was developed by the Apologists, but progress was slow. What Justin Martyr failed to express as he could wish, was afterwards developed by Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

[1] *Mand.*, x. iii. 2.
[2] *The Progress of Dogma*, p. 77, quoting *Sim.*, ix. 12.
[3] *Sim.*, ix. 28. 2.

And in the meantime Tertullian was fashioning the terms in which later Western theology expressed its immemorial belief.

(3) *The Apologists*

The work of the great Apologists was not merely negative, either in defence of Christian morality against slander, or in controversy with Jews and Pagans. They restated the great truths of Natural Religion. Justin Martyr claims that all men have in them a portion of the Divine Word: 'Whatever things were rightly said among all men are the property of us Christians.'[1] From this point they went on to defend the new Revelation. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* Justin maintains that he can recognise true Deity in Christ and yet be a monotheist. But some of his phrases seem to imply that before the creation the Logos existed with God potentially only. In Dr. Orr's words, the chief difference between the theory of the Apologists and Nicene teaching 'was, that while attributing to the Logos a real and eternal mode of subsistence in God, they did not, apparently, regard this mode of subsistence as personal, but held that the "coming forth" or "begetting" (γέννησις) of the Son as a distinct hypostasis was immediately prior to creation, and with a view to it. That is to say, the *Logos* was eternal, but His personal subsistence as *Son* was not. Further, as against the Gnostic view of involuntary emanation, this generation of the Son for the work of creation was represented as an act of the Father's *will*.' This is the view of Justin probably, and of some other leading Apologists certainly; and was the view of Tertullian. He expressly says: 'There was a time when the Father had no Son.' 'It will be evident that this Logos doctrine of the Apologists gave a certain point of support to the later Sabellian and Arian constructions: to the Sabellian, in the idea of the Logos as a *modal*, not personal distinction in the Godhead; and to the Arian, in the admission that there was a time when the Son was not, and that He was produced by an act of the Father's will. Yet nothing could be further

[1] *Second Apol.*, 13.

from the minds of the Apologists than to give support to either of these views. Their view differs diametrically from that of the Arians, in that they held the Son to be truly of the Father's essence; and it differs from the Sabellian, in that they affirmed the existence of three distinct *hypostases*, or persons, in the Godhead, antecedent to and since the creation.'[1]

This admirable summary by an eminent Presbyterian scholar is sufficient proof that the undivided Church has not been guilty of special pleading in defence of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ against all manner of rationalising heresies. The practical lesson which we need to learn is that as heresies represent tendencies common to the human mind in every age, and must reappear again and again, so progress in the definition of doctrine is only made by those who are not afraid to press on in spite of the risk of making mistakes. They must be both willing to learn from the experience of the past, and hopeful that the Holy Spirit, guiding the commonsense of the universal Church, will correct errors due to mistaken zeal.

We may draw an excellent illustration of this from the life of the Apologist Tertullian, whose fervid African feeling stirred him to expound with rare eloquence the religion which the patience and courage of Christian martyrs had led him to adopt. His legal training enabled him to do a great work in moulding forms of Christian thought. He was not the first to use the term 'Trinity,' which, in its Greek form *Trias*, we owe to the writer Theophilus of Antioch. But he made it current coin, and he introduced the use of the terms 'Person' and 'Substance.'[2] There was some danger lest legal ideas should dominate Christian use of these terms. In the eye of a jurist a man of *substance* is a man possessed of property, and a *person* is a being with legal rights, *e.g.* the right to hold property, so that a corporation can possess property though it is only by a fiction that it can be said to live. Through such analysis Tertullian

[1] J. Orr, *The Progress of Dogma*, p. 80.

[2] He names God and His Word and His Wisdom as the Triad, *ad Autol.*, ii. 15.

illustrated the idea of divine existence as of one substance shared by three persons in one condition, and since there is nothing to hinder one and the same person from holding two kinds of property, Tertullian proceeded to illustrate the doctrine of the Incarnation through the same metaphor, suggesting that the same Person Jesus Christ might own the two substances of Godhead and manhood at the same time.[1]

Yet this juristic sense of the word gave way to philosophical meanings. We have no right to build on this teaching, as Dr. Harnack does, a theory that Tertullian introduced into Christianity a system of legal fictions.[2] The ordinary language of mankind is, as some one has said, no mean metaphysician. Words attach to themselves in common talk deep philosophical meanings. A 'person' in Tertullian's mind meant one who had property; therefore he seems to avoid the use of the word in speaking of the Trinity, using the word 'Three' alone, just as Augustine at a later time apologised for the term:

'For indeed, since Father is not Son, and Son is not Father, and the Holy Spirit, who is also called the gift of God, is neither Father nor Son, they are certainly three. And so it is said in the plural, "I and the Father are one"—for he did not say "is one" as the Sabellians say, but "are one." Yet when it is asked what the three are, human utterance is weighed down by deep poverty of speech. All the same we say three "persons," not that we wish to say it, but that we may not be reduced to silence.'[3]

For us, thanks in a great measure to the self-questioning of S. Augustine, 'person' has a deeper meaning. We think of one who acts, who can think and feel and will, and our larger conception of human personality enables us to form a higher and nobler conception of Divine Personality. For us 'substance' is that which exists, and we find that Tertullian also passes to this wider philosophical use of the term: 'The Son I derive from

[1] *Adv. Prax.*, 27: Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum sed coniunctum in una persona, deum et hominem Jesum.

[2] *Hist. of Dogma* (ed. 2), ii. 307.

[3] *De Trin.*, v. 10.

no other source but from the substance of the Father,'[1] meaning the whole being of the Father. Thus Tertullian prepared the way for the widespread belief of the West that the Son is of one substance with the Father, which (as we have seen) Hosius suggested for insertion in the Nicene Creed. Indeed the following words of Bishop Bull are by no means out of date: 'Read only his single work against Praxeas, in which he treats fully and professedly of the most holy Trinity; he there asserts the consubstantiality of the Son so frequently and plainly, that you would suppose the author had written after the time of the Nicene Council.'[2]

It is difficult to decide whether to class Irenæus with the Apologists or with the next generation of teachers. True he wrote no formal Apology for Christianity, but his early life was spent in Asia Minor, which was at that time the scene of the greatest spiritual activity in the Church, and in his long controversy with Gnosticism he built on the foundations which Justin and others had laid.

Gnosticism in all its forms was a serious attempt to deal with the problem of evil. All the fantastic theories of Aeons emanating from the supreme Good God, of a demiurge or creator of this world of sin and pain, were motived by the desire to explain the mystery of pain. In opposition to Gnostic theories Irenæus taught the eternal coexistence of the Logos with the Father, denying that He was made, or that generation implies creation, or that any theory of emanation can express the mystery of the eternal relationship of Son to Father. His deepest interest was centred in the idea of the Incarnation as the fulfilment of the eternal purpose of God in spite of sin. Man made in the image of God, endowed with reason, and free will, lost through sin the likeness of God, the capacity for immortality, which is restored in Christ as the second Adam. 'On account of His infinite love He became what we are, that He might make us what He himself is.'

Thus S. Irenæus united his teaching that the Supreme

[1] *Adv. Prax.*, 4. [2] *Def. of Nicene Council*, ii. vii., Ox. Tr.

God is the Creator of the world, with the message of redemption which Christ brought for the sin of the world. 'The vision of God is the life of man.'

These thoughts lead us up to the point at which, in view of Arian speculation, the term *Homo-ousios* (of one substance) is the only adequate safeguard of that perfect Unity with the Father in nature which is the highest claim of our Lord. We must bear in mind the probability that S. Athanasius did not suggest the term though he was always loyal to it.

The leading ideas in his earlier treatise recur in his later writings. They are enlarged in the light of wider experience, but in no sense modified. There is a wonderful unity between his earlier and later teaching. His knowledge is riper, but the keynote is the same in devotion to the Master for whom He was content to suffer.

> 'Who is the happy Warrior? it is he who, brought
> Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
> Upon the plan that pleased his childish thought.'

The world has never had a brighter illustration of the power of faith to overcome the world (1 John v. 4) than in 'lionhearted Athanase.' In the famous words of Richard Hooker:

'This was the plain condition of these times: the whole world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against it; half a hundred of years spent in doubtful trial which of the two in the end would prevail, the side which had all, or else the part which had no friend but God and death, the one a defender of his innocency, the other a finisher of all his troubles.'[1]

[1] *Eccles. Polity*, v. xiii. 5.

CHAPTER V

NICENE TEACHING ON THE INCARNATION

(1) *Introductory—The Teaching of S. Athanasius*

The best introduction to Nicene teaching on the Incarnation is to be found in the treatise of the great S. Athanasius *On the Incarnation*, which he wrote as a young man before the controversy began. The following passage may suffice at least to show the strength of the conviction to which he was so true.[1]

'For this purpose then, the incorporeal and incorruptible and immaterial Word of God comes to our realm, howbeit He was not far from us before. For no part of creation is left void of Him: He has filled all things everywhere remaining present with His own Father. But He comes in condescension to show loving-kindness upon us, and to visit us. And seeing the race of rational creatures in the way to perish, and death reigning over them by corruption . . . lest the creature should perish, and His Father's handiwork in men be spent for nought—He takes unto Himself a body, and that of no different sort from ours. For He did not simply will to become embodied, or will merely to appear. For if He willed merely to appear, He was able to effect His divine appearance by some other and higher means as well. But He takes a body of our kind, and not merely so, but from a spotless and stainless virgin, knowing not a man, a body clean, and in very truth pure from intercourse of men. For being Himself mighty, and Artificer of everything, He prepares the body in the Virgin as a temple unto Himself, and makes it His very own as an instrument, in it manifested and in it dwelling. And thus taking from our bodies one of like nature, because all were under penalty of the corruption of death He gave it over to death in the stead of all, and offered it to the Father—doing this, moreover, of His loving kindness, to the end that, firstly, all being held to have died in Him, the law involving the ruin of

[1] Acts xvii. 27.

men might be undone (inasmuch as its power was fully spent in the Lord's body, and had no longer holding-ground against men, His peers), and that, secondly, whereas men had turned towards corruption, He might turn them again towards incorruption, and quicken them from death by the appropriation of His body and by the grace of the Resurrection, banishing death from them like straw from fire.

'What then was God to do? or what was to be done save the renewing of that which was in God's image, so that by it men might once more be able to know Him? But how could this have come to pass save by the presence of the very Image of God, our Lord Jesus Christ? For by men's means it was impossible, since they are but made after an image; nor by angels either, for not even they are (God's) images. Whence the Word of God came in His own person, that as He was the image of the Father, He might be able to create afresh the man after the image.

'For as, when the likeness painted on a panel has been effaced by stains from without, he whose likeness it is must needs come once more to enable the portrait to be renewed on the same wood: for, for the sake of his picture, even the mere wood on which it is painted is not thrown away, but the outline is renewed upon it; in the same way also the most holy Son of the Father, being the Image of the Father, came to our region to renew man once made in His likeness, and find him, as one lost, by the remission of sins.'

(2) *The Person of the Redeemer*

It has already been pointed out that the first Nicene Creed differed in important respects from the Creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea on which it was based. Perhaps the most important of the changes made was the prominence given to the doctrine of the Divine Sonship, all the clauses following being referred back to the *Son* instead of the *Word* (Logos). This emphasises the importance of the words which follow on the Eternal Generation. Every clause is carefully balanced, *e.g.* begotten not made, of one substance with the Father. The Arians were inclined to confuse the participles *begotten* and *made*.

The Creed of Eusebius	The Creed of the Council
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God,	And in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten

	of the Father, that is of the substance of the Father,
God of God, Light of Light (Life of Life)	God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God,
only begotten Son (first-born of all creation, before all worlds begotten of God the Father),	begotten not made, of one substance with the Father,
by whom all things were made:	by whom all things were made, both those in heaven and those on earth:

These solemn words require detailed exposition.

And. We profess the same belief in the Second Person of the Trinity as in the First, and again in the Third (Art. 9). 'Ye believe in God, believe also in ME' (John xiv. 1), said our Lord at the solemn moment when He had instituted the Holy Eucharist. *One Lord Jesus Christ.* The whole phrase comes from 1 Cor. viii. 6, but S. Paul writes again to the Ephesians *One Lord* (iv. 5), and (in Rom. x. 9-13) identifies Him with the Lord Jehovah on whom the prophet Joel (ii. 32) bade men call. Compare John viii. 58 with Exod. iii. 14. *Jesus* is the human Name which the Saviour of mankind has exalted above every name (Phil. ii. 20). *Christ* the Anointed is the title which signifies His fulfilment of the expectation of the Jews as their looked-for Messiah (John i. 41). *The Son of God.* Thus He was hailed by Nathanael (John i. 49), by S. Peter in his great confession, also by Martha (John xi. 27) and S. Thomas (John. xx. 28). The construction of the clauses *begotten of the Father only begotten that is of the substance of the Father, God of God,* is not free, as Dr. Bindley shows, from ambiguity. Hort concluded that *begotten* 'did double duty combined alike with "*of the Father*" and with "*God of God,*"' the clause '*that is of the substance of the Father*' being parenthetic. Thus there would be no real pause between the seven words, '*of the Father only begotten God of God.*' 'The familiarity of the phrase *only begotten God,* based upon St. John's usage (i. 18), is abundantly proved, but there is also sufficient authority for regarding *God of God* as an independent phrase by itself, *e.g.* in the Cæsarean Creed of Eusebius, in the Lucianic Creed of Antioch, and in a

creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus (=the wonder-worker).[1] The parenthesis, if it be a parenthesis, is extremely awkward, and does not appear to have been admitted into any local Creed which was expanded by means of Nicene additions.[2] On the other hand, it is certain from the statements of Eusebius and of Athanasius that the words "*of the substance of the Father*" were meant to interpret, not "*only begotten*," but "*begotten of the Father.*"[3] On the whole, it is perhaps simpler to understand both "*only begotten*" and "*that is of the substance of the Father*" as explanatory of "Of the *Father*," and to take "*God of God*" independently as a fresh clause in apposition with "*the Son of God*," and as adopted from the Cæsarean Creed.'[4]

The preposition 'of' denotes origin and derivation from the Father as the Fountain of Deity (John v. 26, '*As the Father* hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' Cf. viii. 42, xvi. 28).[5]

Light of light is based on Heb. i. 3.

S. Athanasius has the phrase '*true God of true God.*'[6]

Begotten of the Father.—'The Arians,' writes Dr. Bindley, 'admitted the Son's Generation from the Father, but rejected the logical consequence of this admission in the case of a Generation which was Divine and unique. True Generation from a Divine Being must imply in the One Generated the possession of the same Divine Nature, and the Generation itself must therefore be of an eternal character. "*Of the Father*" was thus explained and defined as "*of the substance*" and "*of one substance.*"[7]

The solemn words of S. Gregory of Nazianzus are not out of date: 'Speculate not upon the Divine Generation, for it is not safe . . . but the doctrine is to be honoured silently . . . It is a great thing for thee to know the fact; the mode we cannot admit that even angels understand, much less thou.'[8]

The words *before all worlds*, which were not taken over

[1] Hahn, p. 254; Mansi, i. 1030.
[2] Except in the Epiphanian Shorter Creed.
[3] Eusebius, apud Socr., i. 8; Athan. *De Decr. Nic.*, 19, *ad Afros.*, 5.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 29. [5] Westcott, *ad loc.* [6] *Expos. Fid.*, i.
[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 27. [8] cxxxix. 8.

by the Council, retain their original place in the revised Creed, having stood in the Old Jerusalem Creed as in the Creed of Eusebius. The expression is not in Scripture, but conveys the sense of such words of the Lord as John xvii. 5, *the glory which I had with Thee before the world was . . . .*, 24, *Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*

Of one substance with the Father.—As I have explained above, p. 10, the phrase is intended to express the essential unity of the Son with the Father, and it seems best to keep the translation 'substance,' familiar to us in our version, although in its popular sense it suggests something material. Philosophers used the term 'essence' (*ousia*) 'to denote both the "idea," which logically precedes the thing, and also the material thing considered by itself. Thus with the Stoics it was equivalent to matter (*hule*) or body (*soma*). The Gnostics introduced its use into theology (Iren. i. 5), where it held its idealistic sense. *Homo-ousios* would thus mean "of essential unity." All species of the same genus would be "*homo-ousia*" with each other. But as God is unique in Nature and Essence, One who is *homo-ousios* with Him must be Very God also.'[1]

The following quotation from S. Athanasius 'On the Councils' may suffice as a specimen of his method of argument:

'But if since the Son is from the Father, all that is the Father's is the Son's, as in an image and expression, let it be considered dispassionately, whether an essence foreign from the Father's essence admit of such attributes; and whether such a one be other in nature and alien in essence, and not coessential with the Father. For we must take reverent heed, lest transferring what is proper to the Father to what is unlike Him in essence, and expressing the Father's godhead by what is unlike in kind and alien in essence, we introduce another essence foreign to Him, yet capable of the properties of the first essence, and lest we be silenced by God Himself, saying, "My glory I will not give to another," and be discovered worshipping this alien God, and be accounted such as were the Jews of that day, who said "Wherefore dost Thou, being a man, make Thyself God?" referring, the while, to another source the things of the Spirit, and blas-

[1] Bindley, *Op. cit.*, p. 34 *n.*

phemously saying, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub" (Is. xlii. 8; John x. 33; Luke xi. 15). But if this is shocking, plainly the Son is not unlike in essence, but coessential with the Father; for if what the Father has is by nature the Son's, and the Son Himself is from the Father, and because of this oneness of godhead and of nature He and the Father are one, and he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, reasonably is He called by the fathers "Co-essential"; for to what is other in essence, it belongs not to possess such prerogatives.'[1]

We have considered above (p. 17) the unfounded theory that the term *Homo-ousios* was accepted at Constantinople in the sense of *Homoi-ousios*, not in the sense of the old orthodoxy of the Nicene Council, but with a new meaning given to it by the Antiochenes and the Cappadocians.

By whom all things were made.—There is abundant Scriptural authority (1 Cor. viii. 6, John i. 3, Col. i. 16), for teaching that the Son co-operated with the Father in the creation of the world. S. Athanasius also quotes Heb. xi. 3 in this connection: '*By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the Word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear.* For God is good, or rather is essentially the source of goodness: nor could one that is good be niggardly of anything: whence, grudging existence to none, He has made all things out of nothing by His own Word, Jesus Christ our Lord.'

S. Cyril of Alexandria quotes Ps. xxxiii. 6:

'*By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Spirit of His mouth*: Is not, I pray you, the Word, Who is from and in Him, personally distinguished from God the Father? B. He is indeed distinguished, for He subsists peculiarly, though He be consubstantial. A. Seeing therefore the Father brought all things into being and established the heavens, how is the Word the Creator of them? Tell me, who desire to learn this. B. Willingly. But this disquisition is acute and subtle. The one nature of Deity is known by us and by the holy angels, in the holy and consubstantial Trinity. And the Father is in His own Person most perfect, as is the Son and the Spirit: for the creative energy of one of those just now named, in whatever thing it is exercised, is the efficacy of that One; yet it permeates all the Deity, and is the work of the uncreated sub-

[1] *De Synodis*, c. 50.

stance, as if something in common, at the same time that singly it is appropriated to each Person, so that through the three Persons it should be peculiarly fitted to each, every one being complete in itself. The Father therefore worketh, but by the Son in the Spirit. And the Son worketh as the Power of the Father, being understood according to His own existence to be in Him and from Him. And the Spirit worketh, for He is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, the Maker of all things.'[1]

If we may conclude that it was S. Cyril of Jerusalem who grafted this section of the first Nicene Creed into his Creed of Jerusalem, it is to his Catechetical lectures that we must look for help in illustration of its meaning. But for the sake of clearness I will first repeat it side by side with the unrevised Creed of Jerusalem to be extracted from his Catechetical Lectures.

Creed of Jerusalem	Our Nicene Creed
And in one Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God begotten of His Father,	And in one Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God begotten of His Father before all worlds, [*God of God*], Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father by whom all things were made:
very God before all worlds,	
by whom all things were made:	

Enough has been said[2] about S. Cyril's hesitation to accept the new terms in his early days. But it is most necessary to show clearly that this did not imply any hesitation to pay Divine honour to the Lord, to give Him the worship which, as S. Athanasius was never tired of insisting, is idolatry if addressed to a created Being.

'For the throne at God's right hand He received not, as some have thought, because of His patient endurance, being crowned as it were by God after His Passion; but throughout His being—a being by eternal generation,—He holds His royal dignity, and shares the Father's seat, being God and Wisdom and Power, as hath been said; reigning together with the Father, and creating all things for the Father, yet lacking nothing in the dignity of Godhead, and knowing Him that hath begotten Him, even as He is known of Him that hath begotten; and to speak briefly, remem-

[1] *Dial.* vi., *De Trin.*

[2] P. 21.

ber thou what is written in the Gospels, that *none knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any the Father save the Son.*'[1]

(3) *The Life and Work of the Redeemer*

	Jerusalem, A.D. 348	S. Epiphanius, A.D. 374
3.	And was incarnate,	3. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate, *of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary* and was made man,
	And was made man,	
4.	Was crucified,	4. And was crucified *also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered* and was buried,
	And was buried,	
5.	And rose again the third day,	5. And He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures,
6.	And ascended into heaven,	6. And ascended into heaven,
7.	And sat at the right hand of the Father,	7. And *sitteth* at the right hand of the Father,
8.	And is coming in glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end.	8. And is coming again with glory to judge the quick and the dead whose kingdom shall have no end.

Who for us men, etc.—These phrases 'for us' and 'for our salvation' express distinct ideas. The Gospel is a message to man as he is, a sinner needing Redemption. But the New Testament contains scattered hints that the glory of the Incarnation of the Son of God would have been revealed even if man had not sinned.[2] In any case we should have needed a Teacher and a Leader, as men created for Him and in His image. Because we have sinned He came 'for our salvation,' under circumstances saddened by suspicion and suffering and death. We may never forget all that it cost to redeem our souls. But we find food for thankful meditation in the thought of this restoration to our original destiny, this 'Gospel of Creation,' as Bishop Westcott[3] calls it in a fine phrase. It is sometimes designated the Scotist theory of the

[1] Cat., iv. 7; Matt. xi. 27; John x. 15, xvii. 25.
[2] Col. i. 13 ff.; cf. Eph. iii. 9 ff., iv. 10.
[3] *Epistles of S. John*, p. 273.

Incarnation, because Duns Scotus (+1308) was the most distinguished theologian of the Middle Ages who advocated it. It is suggested by earlier and more distinguished teachers of the Church. It kindled the glowing imagination of Irenæus, who passes from the thought of man as fallen to the thought of the absolute purpose of the Incarnation: 'If man had not conquered the adversary of man, the enemy would not have been justly conquered. And again, if God had not bestowed salvation, we should not have possessed it surely. And if man had not been united to God, he could not have partaken of incorruption. For it was necessary that the Mediator of God and men by His own essential relationship with both should bring both together into friendship and concord, and on the one hand present man to God, and on the other make God known to man.'[1] This thought was much in the mind of S. Hilary of Poitiers.

Came down.—This word expresses the self-emptying of the Divine Word, who laid aside His glory (Phil. ii. 7).

Was incarnate.—The Arians evaded the plain meaning of the words. The School of Lucian taught that the Word took flesh only without a human soul,[1] and this was brought out clearly by Eudoxius of Constantinople. So the Council of Nicæa added *dwelt amongst men as man*, in place of an expressive phrase of Eusebius 'lived as a citizen among men.' This was intended to express, in Dr. Bindley's words, 'the *permanent* union of God with human nature; but as it afterwards proved, it was not sufficiently technical to exclude heretical theories as to the mode of the union, whether by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh (Apollinarianism) or by union with a human person (Nestorianism).'[3]

In the revised Creed of S. Cyril mention is made of the mode of the Incarnation through the miraculous conception, which had always found a place in S. Cyril's lectures as in the Old Roman Creed.[4]

And was crucified for us.—Here again the death of

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 18. 7.
[2] S. Epiphanius, *Ancor.*, 33.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 39.
[4] *Cat.*, iv. 9.

our Lord, which in the Western Creed is brought before us as a historical fact, is in the Eastern Creed made the basis of a theological argument. But our theology analyzes our experience. History proves that from the day of Pentecost the power of Christianity as a missionary religion has been the preaching of Christ crucified. Beneath the Cross multitudes of sin-bound souls have found the burden of sin rolled away, while at the same time they were utterly unable to make any excuse for themselves. And the reality of their repentance has been shown in the response which they have made to the call for sacrifice of will, of pleasure, of ease, which finds its motive and support in Christ's sufferings. The Church has never formulated any theory of the Atonement, beyond this Scriptural phrase which was on the lips both of S. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 18) and S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3). There is room in each succeeding age for large interpretations of its bearing on the needs of souls. Thus in our own time many of us have felt that Dr. Dale's book on the Atonement supplied something that was lacking in Dr. M'Leod Campbell's presentation of the doctrine. Dr. Dale himself foretold that further advance could not be made until the doctrine of Personality human and divine had been restated. His prophecy has been fulfilled in the well-known Bampton Lectures of Dr. Illingworth, upon which followed the great work of Dr. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*. Again we note advance. Dr. Moberly shows that Dr. Dale had stopped short of the teaching of S. Paul in Rom. viii., that we must never be content in our meditations on Calvary to omit the thought of Pentecost. He who conquered for us now conquers in us through His Spirit. It is the grace of His Spirit that makes us worthy of forgiveness from the first moment when we turn our faces to the light, and like the penitent thief responding to the mute appeal of the sinless Sufferer, are justified by faith which welcomes more grace to cleanse and sanctify and perfect every soul. This is a theme on which it is impossible to dwell within the limits of this book. But these sentences may suffice to show that Christian thought,

while progressing, is still guided by the old landmarks. We run our race still 'looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith' (Heb. xii. 2).

Under Pontius Pilate.—The addition of Pilate's name, probably from an Antiochian source, brought the revised Creed into line with the Old Roman, and was possibly an important link in the chain of resemblances upon which Pope Leo based his acceptance of the Constantinopolitan Creed at Chalcedon.

S. Augustine[1] suggested that Pilate's name fixed the date of the Crucifixion, a theory which found favour also with Rufinius.[2] It fits in with the references in Pliny's letter to Trajan and in the *History* of Tacitus. But the argument cannot carry the weight of a further theory that the archetype of all creeds which includes Pilate's name must have been written in Palestine, on the ground that the name of the Governor would only be of interest to the district which he governed.[3]

Dr. Bindley has an interesting note on the way in which events in Barbadoes are dated by the names of the Governors. The hurricane of 1898 is said to have happened in the time of Sir James Hay. But Pliny's letter shows that Christian tradition in Bithynia also associated Pilate's name with the record of the Lord's death. Indeed it seems so natural that it is strange that elaborate explanations should be sought for it, such as Dr. Zahn's theory that the name was inserted to prove that the story was historical, and not a myth devised to teach a certain moral.

And suffered and was buried.—Some heretics in S. Cyril's time still taught the Docetic theory that our Lord's sufferings were unreal. His warning is worth quoting:

'If any say that the Cross is an illusion, turn away from him. Abhor those who say that Christ was crucified to our fancy only; for if so, and if salvation is from the Cross, then is salvation a fancy also; but *if Christ be not risen we are yet in our sins.* If the Cross is fancy the Ascension is also fancy; and if the Ascension is fancy, then is the second coming also fancy, and everything is henceforth unsubstantial.'[4]

---

[1] *De Fid. et Symb.*, 11. [2] *In Symb. ap.* 16.
[3] Marian Morawsky, *Z. für k. Theol.*, 1895. [4] *Cat.*, xiii. 37.

The early Jerusalem Creed added *buried*, which naturally came into the revised Creed. S. Paul found occasion to emphasise the fact (1 Cor. xv. 3). S. Cyril added to it teaching on the Descent into Hell, which began to find mention in Creeds at this time, but did not put it in his revised Creed.

And He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.—In mention of the Scriptures we have another Pauline feature (1 Cor. xv. 4). We may suppose that S. Paul had in his mind such passages as Ps. xvi. 10, Hosea vi. 2. S. Cyril chose this passage 1 Cor. xv. 1-4 as his text for his Lecture on the Resurrection, and comments as follows :—

'As an Apostle, therefore, has sent us back to the testimonies of the Scriptures, it is good that we should get full knowledge of the hope of our salvation ; and that we should learn first whether the divine Scriptures tell us the season of His Resurrection, whether it comes in summer or in autumn, or after winter ; and from what kind of place the Saviour has risen, and what has been announced in the admirable Prophets as the name of the place of the Resurrection, and whether the women, who sought and found Him not, afterwards rejoice at finding Him ; in order that when the Gospels are read, the narratives of these holy Scriptures may not be thought fables nor rhapsodies.'[1]

There is an eloquent passage in S. Athanasius on the reasons for His Rising the third day, not sooner, to prove that He truly died ; not later, to guard the identity of His body, not to keep long in suspense those whom He had told about the Resurrection, 'while those who had slain Him were still living on the earth and were on the spot and could witness to the death of the Lord's body, the Son of God Himself, after an interval of three days, showed His body, once dead, immortal and incorruptible; and it was made manifest to all that it was not from any natural weakness of the Word that dwelt in it that the body had died, but in order that in it death might be done away by the power of the Saviour.'[2]

This victory over death is demonstrated by the courage given to martyrs, "death being deprived of all his power"

[1] *Cat.*, xiv 2 [2] *De Incarn.*, § 26.

in each one of them that hold His faith and bear the sign of the Cross.

'For now that the Saviour works so great things among men, and day by day is invisibly persuading so great a multitude from every side, both from them that dwell in Greece and in foreign lands, to come over to His faith, and all to obey His teaching, will any one still hold his mind in doubt whether a Resurrection has been accomplished by the Saviour, and whether Christ is alive, or rather is Himself the Life? Or is it like a dead man, to be pricking the consciences of men, so that they deny their hereditary laws and bow before the teaching of Christ?'[1]

And ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father.—This going up answers to His coming down, and expresses the resumption of His Divine glory which He had laid aside. The change to *sitteth* from the past tense *sat down* of the old Jerusalem Creed corresponds to S. Cyril's teaching.

'Let us not curiously pry into what is properly meant by the throne; for it is incomprehensible: but neither let us endure those who falsely say, that it was after His Cross and Resurrection and Ascension into heaven, that the Son began to sit on the right hand of the Father. For the Son gained not His throne by advancement;[2] but throughout His being (and His being is by an eternal generation) He also sitteth together with the Father. And this throne the Prophet Esaias having beheld before the incarnate coming of the Saviour, says, *I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up*,[3] and the rest. For the Father *no man hath seen at any time*,[4] and He who then appeared to the prophet was the Son. The Psalmist also says, *Thy throne is prepared of old; Thou art from everlasting.*[5]'[6]

And is coming again with glory to judge the quick and the dead.—The change from *in* to *with* is again supported by S. Cyril's usage.

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, then, comes from heaven; and He comes with glory at the end of this world, in the last day. For of this world there is to be an end, and this created world is to

---

[1] *De Incarn.*, § 30.

[2] Some Arians maintained, like Paul of Samosata, that our Lord was promoted to Divine honour in reward of His obedience as Son of Man.

[3] Is. vi. 1. [4] John i. 18. [5] Ps. xciii. 2. [6] *Cat.*, xiv. 27.

be remade anew. For since corruption *and theft, and adultery,* and every sort of sins *have been poured forth over the earth, and blood has been mingled with blood*[1] in the world, therefore, that this wondrous dwelling-place may not remain filled with iniquity, this world passeth away, that the fairer world may be made manifest.'[2]

'Out of thine own conscience shalt thou be judged, thy *thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.* The terrible countenance of the Judge will force thee to speak the truth; or rather, even though thou speak not, it will convict thee. For thou shalt rise clothed with thine own sins, or else with thy righteous deeds.'[3]

'And shouldst thou ever hear any say that the Kingdom of Christ shall have an end, abhor the heresy; it is another head of the dragon, lately sprung up in Galatia. A certain one has dared to affirm, that after the end of the world Christ shall reign no longer; he has also dared to say, that the Word having come forth from the Father shall be again absorbed into the Father, and shall be no more; uttering such blasphemies to his own perdition. For he has not listened to the Lord, saying, *The Son abideth for ever.*[4] He has not listened to Gabriel, saying, *And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end.*'[5]

The heresy to which S. Cyril refers is that of Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia, who though prominent as a leader of the orthodox party at Nicæa fell afterwards into the snare of fanciful speculation, and was condemned universally. He pressed the words of S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 28), about the Son being subjected to the Father that *God may be all in all,* to the point of teaching that the relation of Sonship will pass away, and the Word of God become what Marcellus said He was before the Incarnation, immanent in the Father. There can be little doubt that Marcellus grew confused in his old age. S. Athanasius would never condemn him by name, and when he was questioned by an inquisitive friend would only smile quietly.[6] This throws light also on S. Cyril's silence about his name, which may have been due to respect for his past services to the faith.

Although it is not possible within the proper limits of this chapter to trace the further development of Nicene

[1] Hos. iv. 2. [2] *Cat.*, xv. 3. [3] *Ib.*, 25. [4] John viii. 35.
[5] Lk. i. 33, *Cat.* xv. 27. [6] S. Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.*, lxxii. 4.

theology at any length, the discussion of the Creed at Chalcedon opens out a vista of new theological problems, which were dealt with as they arose, like the Arian speculation, but led likewise to thorny controversies. They were all summed up with remarkable conciseness in the final definition of the Council of Chalcedon, which represents the last word of the early Church on the great subject of the Person of Christ. It is most interesting to watch from far off how inevitably reaction followed, like the regular swing of a pendulum, when any one aspect of Christological teaching was pressed too far. Carried too far by his abhorrence of Arianism, Apollinaris, desiring to magnify the divine glory of Christ, supposed that the Divine Word took in Him the place of the human soul. When it was maintained that our Lord took perfect manhood into union with His Divine Nature, the Nestorians denied that the Babe on Mary's knee was rightly the object of worship, and taught that Jesus was a man who was taken into gradual union with the Eternal Word. And again the pendulum swung back. In their zeal for the honour due, as they felt, to the Mother of the Lord and to His Divinity, Eutychians used rash words about the taking up of the manhood into God as if it were absorbed, like a drop of vinegar in the mighty ocean. We may well shrink from speculation on such themes, but we dare not hesitate to give answers for the faith that is in us when our faith is challenged by new questions. And to aid our thinking the balanced words of the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon come down with perennial freshness :—

'Following, therefore, the holy Fathers, we confess and all teach with one accord one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once perfect (complete) in Godhead and perfect (complete) in manhood, truly God and truly man, and, further, of a reasonable soul and body; of one essence with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one essence with us as regards His manhood, in all respects like us, apart from sin (Heb. iv. 15); as regards His Godhead begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards His manhood—on account of us and our salvation—begotten in the last days of Mary the Virgin, bearer of God; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, proclaimed in two natures, without confusion,

without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed on account of the union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one hypostasis—not as though parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Logos, Lord, Jesus Christ, even as the prophets from of old and the Lord Jesus Christ hath taught us concerning Him, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us.'

Thus in a few words the Church not only repudiated the extremes of Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian teaching, but stated the relation between the two natures in the one Person.[1] Not as though words could explain the mystery, but because words can guard it from unreasonable or insufficient attempts to explain it away.

Thus the coping stone was added to the edifice of doctrinal teaching on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Subsequent developments of error, *e.g.* the heresy of the Adoptionists, a form of revived Nestorianism, have been and may be dealt with on the old lines. The limits of our subject do not allow us to proceed further. But this review of the whole advance from Nicæa to Chalcedon brings us back to the keynote of the whole argument, the justification of S. Athanasius for his loyalty to the Nicene term *Homo-ousios*.

If we go back to our Gospels, even to the irreducible minimum which agnostic critics can save for us as the bedrock of Christian tradition, we are face to face with a mystery of character unique in the history of the world. The mystery of Christ's Person leads us back to the mystery of His Birth. The Church from generation to generation repeats the confession 'God from God,' and does not darken counsel by words without knowledge when she adds 'of one substance with the Father.' As Dr. Illingworth has said very well:—

'People sometimes speak vaguely about Christian dogma having been involved with Greek metaphysics; much as if it were something parallel to being involved with the Ptolemaic astronomy or any other ancient theory which the world has now outgrown. But, in fact, nothing of the kind is the case. The terms in

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Op. cit.*, p. 287.

question were simply adopted as those best calculated to express the specifically Christian idea that Jesus Christ is really God. They do not even carry with them any particular theory of what "essence" or "substance" may be; as is plain from the fact that those very men who insisted on the use of the term "co-essential" insisted equally . . . upon our utter inability to know what the essence of God is. The words, in short, as employed by the Christian Fathers, were stripped of any alien connotation, and simply utilised to denote a particular point of Christian belief; and they are therefore as applicable now as ever, if we retain the patristic Creed.'[1]

---

[1] J. R. Illingworth. *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, Macmillan, 1907, p. 122.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD THE HOLY GHOST

It is sometimes a matter of deep concern to beginners in the study of Christian doctrine when they for the first time realise how slowly the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was developed in comparison with the doctrine of the Person of Christ. It may seem to them to give some support to the suggestion of Unitarian teachers that the Holy Ghost was regarded by the Christians of the first age as an impersonal energy.

There is not, of course, much evidence to be produced. But such as there is may with good reason be called decisive. There is, proportionately, more of it in the New Testament than in the Apostolic Fathers of the next generation. The picture which S. Luke draws for us in the Acts of the Apostles is an outline sketch of men living from day to day in reliance on the guidance and comfort of the Holy Spirit. It was indeed as a fact of spiritual experience that they enjoyed His fellowship. But the great work of evangelisation, and oftentimes the stress of persecution, left but little leisure for meditation concerning the full glory of His Person and the dignity of His relationship to the Father and the Son. S. Paul's teaching, however, on the subject is clear, and shows development from the first. It is probably the fruit of the nine years which he spent at Tarsus before he was summoned by S. Barnabas to Antioch, when he seems to have been chiefly occupied in thinking out the conclusions to which faith in Christ led him.

The importance which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit assumes in the teaching of S. Paul has been strangely neglected. This teaching of S. Paul represents in part

no doubt his own reflections under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But we should be blind indeed if we failed to recognise that he is building all the time on a common basis of belief shared by the Christian Church, to which S. John's letters at a later date bear emphatic testimony. The ultimate source of it is the teaching of the Lord himself, given in a literary form to the Church of the next generation in S. John's Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel, in Dr. Swete's words, 'relates a series of conversations running through the course of our Lord's ministry, which reveal entirely new views of the Spirit's relation to the individual life, to the Church, and to God. . . . But the fullest and clearest revelation was reserved for the last discourse on the night before the Passion (John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13).'[1] The Holy Spirit as an 'advocate' (*paracletos*) was to be Christ's substitute and representative, sent from the Father and the Son on His mission to the disciples and the Church. He was to carry on the teaching work of Christ, helping the disciples to remember Christ's words and to see in them new meanings. Thus He would glorify Christ as Christ glorified the Father, revealing His Lordship (John xvi. 14, 15, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3). And His witness would have power to convince men of the world concerning their sinfulness, divine righteousness, and divine judgments (John xvi. 8).

(1) *The Personality of the Holy Spirit*

We must look first for reasons to explain the slow growth of the doctrine of the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and causes which retarded it, especially in the second century. We have no interest in overlooking any of the evidence, either the very confused doctrine of the prophet Hermas in the second century, or the sad confession of S. Gregory of Nazianzus in the fourth century when he was appointed to the See of Constantinople: 'Some men,' he said, 'regard the Holy Spirit as an energy, some think that He is a creature, others that

[1] Art. *Holy Spirit*, in Hastings' D. B.

He is God, while others do not know which of these opinions to adopt out of reverence for the Scriptures.'

One important factor in the case is beyond question the influence of the Alexandrine Jew Philo, who systematically read Platonism into the Old Testament. His influence, in the words of Dr. Bigg, was 'partly helpful, partly detrimental. It was given to the Alexandrine Jew to divine the possibility and the mode of an eternal distinction in the Divine Unity, and in this respect the magnitude of our debt can hardly be overestimated. How large it is we may measure in part by the fact that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which has no place in his system, remained for a long time meagre, inarticulate and uncertain.'[1] Whether the term the Word (Logos) at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel was taken over from Philo's teaching, directly or indirectly, or was taken direct from poetical passages of the Old Testament, such as Psalm xxxiii. 6, '*By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made,*' does not come into question here. We are concerned not with the origin but with the development of the Logos doctrine, and in that development there is no doubt that Christian writers were encouraged by Philo's speculations to read the Old Testament in the light of Christ's teaching and to philosophise about it. And the pity of it was that one-sided speculation tended to obscure the teaching of the primitive Christian tradition on the Holy Spirit.

A word of warning is necessary here. In a writer such as Clement of Alexandria the doctrine of the Divine Son is very fully developed and the teaching on the Holy Spirit seems scanty. But we must remember that Clement promised a book on the Spirit, which has not come down to us, if it was ever written, and that we are therefore entitled to press to the full the importance of the famous passage in the *Miscellanies* when Clement shows a strong faith in the influence of the Spirit. He is adapting a metaphor from Plato, and pictures the whole hierarchy of created beings as a chain of iron rings, each sustaining and sustained, each saving and saved, held together by the magnetic force of the Holy Spirit.

[1] *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 25

To our shame, however, we must confess that in the second and third centuries, as in the present, the main cause of failure to believe rightly in the Person of the Holy Spirit was beyond doubt worldliness.

We see this clearly in the history of Montanism. The decline of Christian prophecy, which coincided with the strengthening on all sides of the authority of the official ministry, of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, coincided also with a great increase of temptations to worldliness. So far as it was a conservative reaction in favour of prophecy the Montanist movement bore witness to great truths which were endangered. But the claim of Montanus to be the merely passive instrument of the Spirit, and the fanatical zeal of his followers, aroused an opposition which was not all inspired by worldly motives. If Montanist teaching seems to us a parody of the Gospel, we must remember, as it has been well said, that a parody implies an original, and that the original in this case is the Fourth Gospel, weighed, pondered, misunderstood, but bringing to recognition neglected truths that might yet in the future bring succour to vital religion.

We see this fact illustrated in the experience of the Apologist Tertullian. The wilder vagaries of Montanism had no attraction for his cultured mind, to say nothing of his training as a lawyer in caution. No doubt it is true that he would have taught the great bulk of his teaching in any case, even if he had never heard of Montanus. Behind his harsh ruggedness we can discern an ardent nature on fire with the zeal, the fire of love of the Spirit, which was the inspiring motive of Montanism where it was in harmony with the best thought of the first age. Tertullian's magnificent description of Patience, the gift of the Holy Spirit which accompanies Him when He descends, suggested as seems most probable by the patience and courage of the martyr Perpetua, proves that by the best informed thought of his time the Holy Spirit was not conceived of as an impersonal gift, but as a Person.

(2) *The Doctrine in the Third and Fourth Centuries*

A striking exposition of the doctrine is found in Origen's great work *On first Principles*. He writes: 'The Apostles related that the Holy Spirit was associated in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son. But in His case it is not clearly distinguished whether He is to be regarded as generate or ingenerate, or also as a Son of God or not; for there are points which have to be enquired into out of sacred Scripture according to the best of our ability, and which demand careful investigation. And that this Spirit inspired each one of the saints, whether prophets or apostles; and that there was not one Spirit in the men of the old dispensation and another in those who were inspired at the advent of Christ, is most clearly taught throughout the churches.'[1] And in the following sentence he clearly teaches the coeternity of the Holy Spirit: 'The Holy Spirit would never be reckoned in the unity of the Trinity, *i.e.* along with the unchangeable Father and His Son, unless He had always been the Holy Spirit.'

But some of his expressions led to much misunderstanding, as when he is speaking of the *historical revelation* of God, and teaches as an inference from the Fourth Gospel 'that the Spirit owes His origin to the medium of the Son, and that therefore He is in the order of the divine life inferior to the Son.'[2] He is not here dealing with the *inner being* of the Godhead, on which he teaches: 'Nothing in the Trinity can be called greater or less.'[3]

The misadventures of Origen's speculations explain to us the acute fear which S. Cyril of Jerusalem expresses in his Catechetical lectures: 'We would say somewhat concerning the Holy Ghost; not to declare His substance with exactness, for that were impossible.'[4]

'Inquire not curiously into His nature or substance: for had it been written we would have spoken of it; what is not written, let us not venture on; it is sufficient

[1] *De Princ.*, Pref. p. 3.
[2] Bethune-Baker, *Op. cit.*, p. 203.
[3] *De Princ.*, i. p. 34.
[4] *Cat.*, xvi. 5.

for our salvation to know, that there is Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.'[1]

Yet S. Cyril leaves us in no doubt as to his belief in the distinct personality of the Spirit:—

'It is established, that though the titles of the Holy Ghost be different, He is one and the same; living and subsisting, and always present together with the Father and the Son; not uttered or breathed from the mouth and lips of the Father or the Son, nor dispersed into the air, but having a real substance, Himself speaking, and working, and dispensing, and sanctifying; even as the economy of salvation which is to usward from the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, is inseparable and harmonious and one, as we have also said before.'[2]

In the following passage he teaches that the Spirit is the source of all that is beautiful in moral and spiritual life:—

'Why did He call the grace of the Spirit water? Because by water all things subsist; because water brings forth grass and living things; because the water of the showers comes down from heaven; because it comes down one in form, but works in many forms. For one fountain watereth the whole of Paradise, and one and the same rain comes down upon all the world, yet it becomes white in the lily, and red in the rose, and purple in violets and hyacinths, and different and varied in each several kind: so it is one in the palm-tree, and another in the vine, and all in all things; and yet is one in nature, not diverse from itself; for the rain does not change itself, and come down first as one thing, then as another, but adapting itself to the constitution of each thing which receives it, it becomes to each what is suitable. Thus also the Holy Ghost, being one, and of one nature, and indivisible, divides to each His grace, *according as He will*:[3] and as the dry tree, after partaking of water, puts forth shoots, so also the soul in sin, when it has been through repentance made worthy of the Holy Ghost, brings forth clusters of righteousness. And though He is One in nature, yet many are the virtues which by the will of God and in the Name of Christ He works. For He employs the tongue of one man for wisdom; the soul of another He enlightens by prophecy; to another He gives power to drive away devils; to another He gives to interpret the divine Scriptures. He strengthens one man's self command; He teaches another the way to give alms; another He teaches to fast and discipline himself; another He teaches to despise the things of the body; another He trains for martyrdom: diverse in different

[1] *Cat.*, xvi. 24. [2] *Ibid.*, xvii. 5. [3] 1 Cor. xii. 11.

men, yet not diverse from Himself, as it is written, *But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.*[1] . . .'[2]

To the quotation from S. Athanasius given above I may add the following from his letter to Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, at a time when the Arian attack had extended to denial of the Divinity of the Spirit: 'The Spirit is the Son's own image, and He is said to proceed from the Father because He shines forth, and is sent and given by the *Logos*, who is from the Father. He is the Son's very own and not foreign to God.'[3]

It seems as though when the full glory of the truth, revealed and as yet only partially understood, dawned upon these great teachers, their style gained an added glow and warmth, as in the following passage from S. Basil:—

'Who on hearing the titles of the Spirit, does not experience an elevation of soul and rise in thought to the supreme nature? For He is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, the Upright Spirit, the Princely Spirit. Holy Spirit is his peculiar and distinguishing appellation, and this is a name pre-eminently adapted to what is incorporeal, purely immaterial, and indivisible. Accordingly our Lord, when teaching the woman who thought of a local worship of God that the incorporeal was incomprehensible, says, God is a Spirit. It is, then, impossible when we hear of a Spirit to picture to the imagination a circumscribed nature, or one which is subject to turning and changing, or which is at all like the creature; but rising to the sublimest thoughts, we are compelled to think of an intellectual essence, infinite in power, illimitable in magnitude, immeasurable by periods or ages; who ungrudgingly imparts His excellence; unto whom all things needing sanctification turn, for whom all things living long according to their excellence, being, as it were, watered by His breath, and assisted to attain their own proper and natural end; perfective of all else, Himself lacking nothing; who lives not because He is endowed with life, but because He is the giver of life; who does not grow by additions, but is at once full, self-sustaining and everywhere present; the source of sanctification, light invisible, who, as it were, illuminates every faculty of reason in its search for truth; unapproachable by nature, accessible by reason of His goodness; filling all things by His power, but communicable only to the worthy; not shared by all in the same degree, but distributing His energy according to the proportion of faith; simple in essence, manifold in powers;

---

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 7-11. [2] *Cat.*, xvi. 12. [3] i. 21.

wholly present with each individual, and wholly everywhere; impassibly divided, and shared without division, like a sunbeam, whose gracious influence is as much his who enjoys it as though he were alone in the world, but which also blends with the air, and shines over land and sea. Thus, too, the Spirit is present with every one who receives Him, as if there were only one receiver, but bestows sufficient and complete grace on all; whom all things that partake of Him enjoy, according to the capacity of their nature, not to the extent of His power.'[1]

The following passages, from S. Hilary of Poitiers, may be added to show how, *c.* A.D. 361, he upheld, though with caution, the central truth :—

'Thy Holy Spirit, as the Apostle says, searches and knows Thy deep things, and as intercessor for me speaks to Thee words I could not utter . . . nothing, except what belongs to Thee penetrates into Thee; nor can the agency of a power foreign and strange to Thee measure the depth of Thy boundless majesty. . . . Paul . . . thought that the description was sufficient when He called Him Thy Spirit. With these men, peculiarly Thine elect, I will think in these matters . . . I will not trespass beyond that which human intellect can know about Thy Holy Spirit, but simply declare that He is Thy Spirit.'[2]

A crisis was reached with the deposition of Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, who denied the Divinity of the Spirit. The Council of Constantinople, in accepting the revised Creed of Jerusalem, gave prominence to the truth that the Spirit should be worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son. The controversy smouldered on. A graphic picture of it is given in the Catechetical lectures of Niceta of Remesiana, who accuses the Macedonians of raising interminable questions: 'Of what sort is the Holy Ghost? Whence and how great is He? Has He been born? or has He been made?' They were not content with the plain words of the Lord 'He proceedeth from the Father.' They persisted in misapplying the text 'All things were made by Him' (John i. 3) as if it included the Spirit. Niceta argued from their admission that S. John was inspired by the Spirit to write the words, therefore the Spirit could not be included among created beings. He quoted other texts to prove that the

[1] *On the Holy Spirit*, c. 22. [2] *De Trin.*, xii. 55, 56.

Spirit is Lord, that He guides into all truth, sanctifies, absolves, regenerates. His attributes include foreknowledge, goodness and omnipresence. He who is confessed with the Father and the Son at baptism should be worshipped with them, not separately as different gods are worshipped by the heathen, but in the Unity of the Trinity.[1]

(4) *The Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost*

When the Divinity of the Holy Ghost had thus been openly challenged by the Arians and championed by Church leaders, the way was opened for a new development of teaching. A new aspect of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost came into view, which stimulated thought and provoked controversy. As so often happens, this controversy has turned more upon accidentals than essentials, upon the way in which one view was brought into prominence rather than the impossibility of combining it with its opposite in one common formula. It was felt that precisely as the Church had learnt through painful experience to emphasise the Scriptural word 'only begotten' in relation to the Son, so to indicate the relationship of the Holy Spirit they must teach that He is 'not made nor created nor begotten but proceeding.'

Niceta is content to repeat the Scriptural words 'Proceedeth from the Father'; but the question was certain to come up—What is His relationship in this regard to the Son? The quotation which I have given above (p. 85) from S. Athanasius in which He is called 'the Son's own image' shows that the idea of His proceeding from the Father through the Son is not far off. It is one of the lines of thought in which S. Athanasius reveals his sympathy with the modes of thought current in the West.

The difference which afterwards arose between East and West on this subject was due to the fact that they approached the subject from opposite points of view. The Greek Fathers started from the thought of the Eternal Distinctions (Hypostaseis) and reconciled them as best they could with the idea of Divine Unity. They

[1] Cf. my *Niceta of Remesiana*, p. lxiv.

thought of the doctrine of the Trinity as an explanation of the creation, manifested in the work of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. On the other hand, Western teachers began with the idea of the Trinity as 'a necessity of the Divine Life—to use a technical term, as immanent, an abiding reality.' They began from the thought of the coinherence of the Divine Persons, as the Lord taught; '*Thou, Father, art in me and I in thee*' (John xvii. 21). This led them to the thought that the Spirit must be regarded as proceeding in a sense from the Son, because He is '*the Spirit of Jesus*' (Acts xvi. 7). When the words 'And the Son' had been added to 'Proceedeth from the Father' Eastern theologians thought that this would introduce the idea of two fountains (so to speak) of Deity. But this was far from the imagination of the early writers who led men to the edge of the later controversy. Perhaps even now the wound may be healed by use of the more exact phrase 'Proceedeth from the Father through the Son,' which safeguards teaching on each side.

S. Hilary of Poitiers, the great ally of S. Athanasius in the West, is bold to speak of the Father and Son as authors of the Spirit who has His being from the Father and through the Son. In his book *On the Trinity*, he writes :—

'For my own part I think it wrong to discuss the question of His existence. He does exist inasmuch as He is given, received, retained. He is joined with Father and Son in our confession of faith, and cannot be excluded from a true confession of Father and Son. . . . If any man demand what meaning we attach to this conclusion, he as well as we have read the word of the Apostle: "Because ye are sons of God, God hath sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying Abba, Father," and "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God in whom ye have been sealed."'[1]

Such was his answer to Arians and Macedonians. It is the next step in his thought that fixes our attention at the present moment. S. Hilary had no doubt that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son. 'And I question,' he goes on, 'whether it is the same thing to receive from the Son as to proceed from the Father.'[2] He was evidently inclined to answer

[1] *De Trin.*, ii. 29. [2] *De Trin.*, viii. 19, 20.

yes, but was not prepared to insist on it. His book ends with a prayer in which he speaks of the Spirit as from the Father through the Only-Begotten.

We find the same idea in the writings of Victorinus Afer, the teacher of rhetoric whose conversion to Christianity made so great a stir in Rome a short time before the Conversion of S. Augustine.[1] 'The Spirit receives of the Father in receiving of the Son. He is the bond of union between the Father and the Son.'

For the full development of this teaching we must turn to S. Augustine, who did more than any one to mould later Western teaching. Thus in his work *On the Trinity* he distinguishes between *mission* and *procession*, and asserts a true procession of the Spirit from the Son, quoting S. John xx. 22: '*He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*' 'That bodily breathing was a demonstration by a suitable illustration that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son. We must admit that the Father and the Son are the Principle of the Spirit.' He boldly faces the objection that Christ speaks only of a procession from the Father: '*When the Paraclete is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness concerning me*' (John xv. 26). 'He says, "My doctrine is not mine." It was the Father's because He was of the Father. Yet it was His, because He and the Father are One. How much rather then must we understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him also when He saith thus—"proceeds from the Father," that He does not say "He does not proceed from Me."'[2] He is careful to explain that we must not think of the procession from the Son as following the procession from the Father. The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father to the Son and proceed from the Son to sanctify the creation, but He proceeds at the same time from both.

As Dr. Swete well says, 'Augustine never asserts his view in the spirit of a controversialist. If he lays stress upon the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son, if he enforces his opinion with a

[1] See Augustine's *Confessions*.

[2] *De Trin.*, iv. 29.

plainness and explicitness of language hitherto without a precedent, his purpose is neither to encourage speculation nor to provoke discussion, but rather to add completeness and stability to the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity. He is conscious of no conflict of opinion within the Church, his quarrel is only with the Arian and the Macedonian : the *Filioque* is part of his answer to those who denied the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' [1]

I have dealt sufficiently in Part I. with the history of the controversy which arose when the words *Filioque* were added to the Nicene Creed. But it remains to ask whether we can point to any advantage accruing from loyalty to the teaching of Western Christendom in this matter, or in other words, does such speculative teaching bear any fruit in the spiritual life ?

On this point some light has recently been thrown by the late Canon Moberly. He says :—

'The Spirit of the Incarnate is the Spirit of God. But it is not so much the Spirit of God, regarded in His eternal existence, or relation, in the Being of Deity : it is the Spirit of God in Humanity, the Spirit of God become the Spirit of Man in the Person of the Incarnate,—become thenceforward the true interpretation and secret of what true manhood really is,—it is this which is the distinctive revelation of the New Testament, the distinctive significance and life of the Church of Christ. This is the truth, immense in its significance for practical Christianity, which the so-called doctrine of the 'Double Procession' directly protects ; and which the denial of that doctrine tends directly to impair. It may be that the removal of the 'Filioque' from the Nicene Creed, would not necessarily imply a denial of the doctrine : but there can at least be little doubt, historically speaking, that the 'Filioque' has served, to the doctrine, as a bulwark of great importance.' [2]

Similarly Dr. Milligan wrote,

'As the Spirit of the exalted and glorified Lord, He is not the Third Person of the Trinity in His absolute and metaphysical existence, but that Person as He is mediated through the Son, who is human as well as Divine. It is on this particular aspect

---

[1] *Hist. of the Doct. of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 132.
[2] *Atonement and Personality*, p. 195.

of His being that He diffuses Himself through the members of Christ's body, and abides in them.' [1]

The opinions which Dr. Moberly and Dr. Milligan so ably set forth deserve fuller discussion than they have, so far as I know, yet received. Both defend the doctrine of the 'Double Procession' of the Holy Spirit as a matter of practical and not merely metaphysical importance. And yet all the spiritual results for which they contend seem to be secure if it is taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. From the point of view of a practical preacher I believe the statement reported from the lips of an experienced missioner to be profoundly true: 'Whenever due honour is paid to God the Holy Ghost in parochial missions results follow.' The great Western hymns, *Veni, Creator Spiritus* and *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*, to which the Eastern Church can show no parallel, have had their part in the great revivals of spiritual life for which in the Western Church we thank God. Let us pray that we may be enabled to advance along the same path, not unfaithful to truths which our forefathers were at pains to learn. All the same, let us be careful not to overstate the truth so as to give offence to those whom God is leading along another path, as we surely believe, to the same goal.

The possibility of agreement with the Eastern Church is shown by the results of a conference which was held at Bonn in 1875, between Easterns, Anglicans, and Old Catholics, when the following terms of union were agreed on.

We accept the teaching of S. John Damascene on the Holy Ghost, as it is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:—

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father as the beginning, the cause, the source of the Godhead.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son, because there is in the Godhead but one beginning, one cause, through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.

[1] *Ascension of our Lord*, p. 189.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son who is the Image of the Father, issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing power.

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of God declaratory of the Word.

6. The Holy Ghost forms the link between the Father and the Son, and is linked to the Father by the Son.

It will be seen that these statements show that there is a very substantial agreement. And this agreement is still closer in the case of those Easterns who hold that it is lawful to believe that the 'procession' and 'shining forth' of the Spirit *through* the Son is from all eternity. We may hope that in time He who is the Spirit of unity and truth will reunite our scattered forces under the banner of our one Master.

Such is the story of the long controversy on this doctrine which has come under attention, first in the history of our Nicene Creed, and then in the course of exposition of its teaching. Sad to say, it is not through misrepresentation in the progress of heated debate, though that is bad enough, so much as through sheer neglect of the doctrine altogether, that the worst evils have come into being. There are many Christians of to-day who are much in the position of the disciples whom S. Paul found at Ephesus, constrained when they were challenged to answer: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.'

As it was worldliness, more than anything else, that hindered the development of the doctrine in the first centuries, so is it worldliness to-day that hinders soul after soul from attaining to that peace and joy in the Holy Ghost which is the bliss of the kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER VII

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS

Our Nicene Creed does not differ to any important extent from the Apostles' Creed in its teaching on the Church and the Sacraments But there are two additions which, like the reference to the doctrine of the Atonement in Art 5, bring in what one may call a pastoral touch, a hint of the beneficent work of the Church in the shepherding of souls. The first of these is the confession of the Unity of the Church, which is one in doctrine and fellowship. However far we may be from Reunion, it is well that in our holiest moments we should confess that it is the goal of our hopes and prayers.

The second is the coupling of the Sacrament of Baptism with its inward and spiritual grace 'I acknowledge one Baptism *for* the remission of sins.' Some one has said that there is a great deal of divinity (meaning theological teaching) in prepositions. This is true certainly in this case.

Again let us compare the forms :

Jerusalem, A.D. 348	S. Epiphanius, A.D. 374
10. And in one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,	9. In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.
9. And in one holy Catholic Church,	10. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.
11. And in resurrection of the flesh,	11. We look for the resurrection of the dead,
12. And in life eternal.	12. And the life of the world to come.

Apart from the transposition of clauses 9 and 10, by

which S. Cyril brought the Creed into line with the customary order, there are several slight alterations which are significant.

We miss the words 'of repentance' with which the ancient short creed of Jerusalem had ended. But there was no intention to alter the emphasis in dogmatic teaching. S. Cyril's exhortations to repentance are most striking. Baptism, he says, is the end of the Old Testament and beginning of the New. For its author was John, and in the spirit of John the Baptist he declaims against hypocrisy.

'Yet He tries the soul. He casts not his pearls before swine; if thou play the hypocrite, though men baptize thee now, the Holy Spirit will not baptize thee. But if thou approach with faith, though men minister in what is seen, the Holy Ghost bestows that which is unseen. Thou art coming to a great trial, to a great muster, in that one hour, which if thou throw away, thy disaster is irretrievable; but if thou be counted worthy of the grace, thy soul will be enlightened, thou wilt receive a power which thou hadst not. . . . If thou believe, thou shalt not only receive remission of sins, but also do things which pass man's power. And mayest thou be worthy of the gift of prophecy also! For thou shalt receive grace also according to the measure of thy capacity and not of my words; for I may possibly speak of but small things, yet thou mayest receive greater; since faith is a large affair. All thy life long will thy guardian the Comforter abide with thee; He will care for thee, as for His own soldier; for thy goings out, and thy comings in, and thy plotting foes. And He will give thee gifts of grace of every kind, if thou grieve Him not by sin; for it is written, "*And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.*"[1] What then, beloved, is it to preserve grace? Be ye ready to receive grace, and when ye have received it cast it not away.'[2]

In one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.—The Church is *one*, both by unity of outward organisation and also by unity of inward spiritual life. We are too ready to acquiesce in the miserable conditions which prevail in the present day, under which visible unity is broken. Separations between Churches set up barriers between faithful souls, and prevent that interchange of spiritual experience, that fellowship in righteousness and peace

[1] Eph. iv. 30. [2] *Cat.*, xvii. 36, 37.

and joy in the Holy Ghost, which are the characteristics of social life in the Kingdom of God. No wonder that the conversion of the world is hindered, that spiritual hindrances abound. The world will never be convinced by what it cannot see. We must pray for, and expect in God's time, the reunion of Christendom on the largest scale. But this can only come through a great deepening and strengthening of the inner life of the Spirit. It will never come to those who are ready to sacrifice truth for peace. As the Archbishop of York[1] has said in a memorable phrase, what we want is 'not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth.' It is in the ability to take larger views of history, and above all in the insight which can discern spiritual things because it is spiritual, that we shall find new possibilities opened out through the vision of restored unity, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, who also '*maketh men to be of one mind in an house*' (Ps. lviii. 6, *P.B.V.*). In the meantime though the vision tarry we wait for it, and we do well to ponder the opinions of great teachers of the days when the Church though threatened was not divided. S. Ignatius of Antioch writes to the Ephesians: 'Do ye, each and all, form yourselves into a chorus, that being harmonious in concord, and taking the keynote of God, ye may in unity sing with one voice through Jesus Christ unto the Father, that He may both hear you and acknowledge you by your good deeds to be members of His Son. It is therefore profitable for you to be in blameless unity, that ye may also be partakers of God always.'[2]

S. Irenæus also writing at the close of the second century, when schisms were not unknown, though not so serious as in the modern world, writes:—

'A spiritual disciple who truly receives the Spirit of God . . . indeed judges all men, but is himself judged of no man . . . He will judge also those who cause divisions, who are destitute of the Son of God and look to their own profit, rather than to the unity of the Church, who for small reasons and for any reasons cut and divide, and, so far as is in their power, destroy the great and glorious body of Christ, who speak peace and make war, who verily strain out the gnat and swallow the camel; for from them

---

[1] Dr. Lang.

[2] *Eph.* 4.

can come no reformation so great as is the harm of schism. He will judge also all those who are outside the truth, that is, those who are outside the Church.'[1]

The pathetic appeal of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, to Novatian, a schismatic Bishop of Rome, is worthy of mention :—

'If, as you say, you were led on unwillingly, you will prove it if you retire of your own will. For it would be well to suffer anything and everything in order to avoid dividing the Church of God. Martyrdom to avoid rending the Church would not be less glorious than martyrdom to escape idolatry. In my judgment it would be more glorious. For in the one case a man bears testimony to death for the sake of his own single soul; in the other case, the testimony is for the sake of the whole Church. Even now, if you persuade or constrain the brethren to come to concord, the recovery of your standing will be greater than your fall. The fall will not be reckoned; the recovery will be praised. But, if you have no power with the disobedient, take care to save your own soul.'[2]

From the thought of outward unity we turn to the thought of inward unity enjoyed through fellowship in the one life in Christ. This is the keynote of the great High Priestly prayer in which our Lord prayed, 'As thou, O Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us' (John xvii. 21). And St. Paul laboured continuously to enforce the same truth: 'As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body being many are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). Such unity of life begun in Baptism is continued in the Holy Eucharist: 'We who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread' (1 Cor. x. 17). 'This fellowship in the Gospel,' which was for S. Paul the source of deepest joy, is the one abiding possession which reconciles us to the enduring of affliction, the patience needed by those who would tend old sores.

[1] *Adv. Hær.*, iv. 33. 1, 7, quoted by D. Stone, *The Christian Church*, p. 120.

[2] Quoted by Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 45.

But we are not alone in our joy or grief. To St John was revealed the prayer of martyred souls in the unseen World crying 'Lord, How long' (Rev. vi. 10), as well as the praise of those who, in joy unspeakable, see His Face (*ib.* xxii. 4).

> 'One family we dwell in Him,
> One Church above, beneath,
> Though now divided by the stream,
> The narrow stream of death.'

In that blessed 'Communion of Saints,' which the Church here militant already shares with the Church resting, and so far as the conquest of temptation is concerned already triumphant, we have the foretaste of bliss and the secret source of courage unconquerable.

We pass on to think of the Church as *holy*. We are not concerned with the unfortunate omission of the word from our English version.[1] The conception is fundamental, and is alike concerned with our highest hopes and our deepest penitence. The Church is holy because the indwelling Spirit is Holy, because from the beginning all the members of the Church, who have had anything to do with the progress and the extension of the Church, have always set this before them as the ideal, to be consecrated, set apart to live 'in the world' yet 'not of the world,' in Christ, and therefore by His grace changed into the same image from glory to glory. We do not hide from ourselves one stain upon the fair fame of the historic Church, so often betrayed into conduct unworthy of Him whose Name we bear. We are sadly conscious of the blame attaching to each one of us in this regard, of past unworthiness and perhaps worse, whereby we have crucified to ourselves the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame (Heb. vi. 6). But this does not hinder us from claiming as our heritage the status of a 'holy nation, a people for God's own possession' (1 Pet. ii. 9).

S. Paul calls the Christian society 'a holy temple' (Eph. ii. 21) although in the same letter he plainly shows that he regards many of the Christians to whom he writes as

[1] P. 48.

in serious danger of falling into sins of falsehood, anger, and impurity (iv. 25, 26, v. 3). In other words, he is true to the ideal which our Lord, both in the Sermon on the Mount and in His parables, held constantly before the eyes of His disciples. Holiness is the ideal in His kingdom, but in this world evil will be mixed with the good until the Great Day. S. Paul goes on to speak of Christ's purpose to sanctify the Church 'having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish' (Eph. v. 26, 27).

The antithesis, which is often drawn between the visible and the invisible Church, ceases to be a source of perplexity when it is clearly perceived that we can say the above words truly of the Church in the two worlds of the seen and the unseen, and not only of the latter.

The epithet *Catholic* was first used to express the idea of the extension of the Christian society throughout the world. S. Ignatius used it free from all the qualifications which became necessary when heresies began to abound, and to the primary idea of universality were added the ideas of doctrine and unity. To the Smyrnæans he writes: 'Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal (catholic) Church.'[1] To S. Cyril of Jerusalem it meant much more:

'The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout all the world from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to the knowledge of men concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it brings into subjection to godliness the whole race of mankind, governors and governed, learned and ignorant; and because it treats and heals every class of sins that are committed in soul or body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and in words and in every kind of spiritual gifts.'[2]

---

[1] *Cat.* 8. See Lightfoot's note *ad loc.* Mr. Stone, *The Christian Church*, p. 136, suggests that the context brings in the notion of orthodoxy. This was no doubt in the mind of S. Ignatius, but it is not clear that he narrowed the term.

[2] *Cat.*, xviii. 23.

S. Cyril goes on to warn his hearers when they visit strange cities to 'inquire not simply where the Lord's house is, . . . nor simply where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church,' avoiding the meetings of heretics.

A similar interpretation is given by St. Augustine in a letter in which he replies to a Donatist:

'You think you say something sharp when you explain the name Catholic not from the communion of the whole world, but from the keeping of all the commandments of God and of all the Sacraments, as if we, even if perchance the Church is for this reason called Catholic because it truly holds the whole, of which truth certain fragments are found even in different heresies, rest for our proof of the Church in all nations on the testimony of this name, and not on the promises of God and on so many and so clear oracles of the truth itself.'[1]

The term *Apostolic*, which has not come into the Western Creed with *Catholic*, has had a similar history. S. Ignatius salutes the Church of the Trallians 'in the divine plenitude after the Apostolic fashion.' In the description given of the martyrdom of Polycarp in the Letter of the Smyrnæans, Polycarp is described as 'the glorious martyr Polycarp, who was found an apostolic and prophetic teacher in our own time, a bishop of the holy (or Catholic) Church which is at Smyrna.' Here the term corresponds to the teaching of S. Paul in the passage in which he speaks of the Church as 'the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets' (Eph. ii. 20). This idea of the historical succession of apostolic men, who in generation after generation, continued the work of building up the Church, is very attractive. Tertullian defies heretics to trace back the origin of their Churches to Apostles, and the passage shows us the practical importance already attached to the principle of Apostolic succession, of orderly transmission of authority from one generation to another:

'If any dare to connect themselves with the Apostolic age that they may appear to have descended from the Apostles because

[1] Ep. xciii. 23, quoted by Mr. Stone, *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

they have been under the rule of the Apostles, we can say, Let them declare the origins of their Churches, let them unfold the succession of their bishops, so coming down from the beginning with continuous steps that the first bishop may have had as his consecrator and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of Apostolic men who remained in the communion of the Apostles.'[1]

It is this conception of an authority obedient to the law of its own existence, loyal to the past yet not out of harmony with the present, that is the strength of the system of Episcopacy. But it is with something more than confidence in Episcopal Orders and discipline that the Church claims the attribute Apostolic. It is with the sense of a Divine mission to mankind, trusted to carry on an occupation 'as definite as a soldier's' in the perpetual conflict against evil and misery and ignorance, that the Church of to-day accepts the solemn charge, 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you'[2] (John xx. 21).

We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.— Some ancient writers on the Creeds make a great point of a distinction which is of real importance, that our faith is a faith in Persons, not in things or ideas. In this instance our faith is in God the Holy Ghost, not in Baptism as a ceremony, or in the idea of remission of sins as connected with preparation for receiving the Sacrament of Baptism. It is the Holy Ghost who sanctifies water to the mystical washing away of sins, who stimulates and accepts our imperfect faith and repentance, who alone gives grace of perseverance to the baptized children of God in their weary warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil. This conception was marked according to Rufinus, for example, by the use of the preposition *in*, which he taught should be used before the names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but not when mention is made of the Church or of remission of sins, because our faith in the Holy Ghost carries with it belief that He dwells in and works through the Church, as through the waters of Baptism. And as it is only by the Holy Ghost that we are enabled to confess our faith in Jesus as the Lord, so it is His

[1] *De Præscr. Hær.*, 32.
[2] Dean Church's *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 127.

privilege to make the Lord's sacrifice of Himself on the Cross effectual for each believer, making us one with Him, making His life our life.

'So it is,' writes Bishop Westcott, 'that the remission of sins has always been connected with Baptism, the Sacrament of incorporation. "We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins" that so the realisation of the atonement may be most vividly connected with the entrance on a new being. And here there is nothing unreal: nothing inconsistent with the purest images which we can form of the justice and holiness of God: nothing which is not confirmed by the experience of the human soul as it strives to forgive.'[1]

The question is sometimes raised, why is only one Sacrament mentioned in the Creed? The answer is obvious, because we there speak of first principles only. Just so the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 2) puts among the first principles of Christianity the teaching of Baptism and of laying on of hands, and then goes on to speak of resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, thus covering the whole life of the baptized from beginning to end. The second great Sacrament of the Gospel, the Holy Eucharist, is not ignored although it is not mentioned. It belongs to the next stage in the Christian life, when the soul that has been hitherto nourished with the milk of the Word is full-grown and able to partake of solid food (Heb. v. 13, 14), is fed with Bread from heaven, not once only, but throughout the remaining days of his earthly pilgrimage.

As Hooker has said in memorable words: 'We receive Christ Jesus in Baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist after, as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life. . . . The grace which we have by the Holy Eucharist doth not begin but continue life. No man therefore receiveth this Sacrament before Baptism, because no dead thing is capable of nourishment. That which groweth must of necessity first live. If our bodies did not daily waste, food to satisfy them was a thing superfluous. And it may be that the grace of Baptism would serve to eternal life, were it not that the state of

[1] *Historic Faith*, p. 133.

our spiritual being is daily so much hindered and impaired after Baptism.'[1]

We look for the resurrection of the dead.—As I have shown above, S. Cyril implies that he preferred 'of the dead,' to 'of the flesh,' probably in fear of materialistic explanations. He is careful to explain. 'For this body shall be raised, not remaining weak as now; but raised the very same body, though by putting on incorruption it shall be fashioned anew,—as iron blending with fire becomes fire, or rather as He knows how, the Lord who raises us. This body therefore shall be raised, but it shall abide not such as it now is, but an eternal body; no longer needing for its life such nourishment as now, nor stairs for its ascent, for it shall be made spiritual, a marvellous thing, such as we cannot worthily speak of.'[2]

From this point of view it will be noticed that our Nicene Creed is freed from the ambiguity which at times has permitted materialistic explanations to gather round the words, 'resurrection of the flesh,' in the Apostles' Creed.

There is a note of triumph in the personal touch, 'We look for,' which rings through the following passage:—

'The root of all good works is the hope of the Resurrection: for the expectation of the recompense nerves the soul to good works. For every labourer is ready to endure the toils, if he sees their reward in prospect; but when men weary themselves for nought, their heart soon sinks as well as their body. A soldier who expects a prize is ready for war, but none is forward to die for a king who is indifferent about those who serve under him, and bestows no honour on their toils. In like manner every soul believing in a Resurrection is naturally careful of itself; but, disbelieving it, abandons itself to perdition. He who believes that his body shall remain to rise again, is careful of his robe, and defiles it not with fornication. . . . Faith therefore in the Resurrection of the dead is a great commandment and doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church; great and most necessary, though gainsaid by many, yet surely warranted by the truth.'[3]

The question has been raised whether there is any hint here that the Church anticipated a speedy coming for a

[1] *Eccles. Polity*, v. lvii. 6; lxvii. 1. [2] *Cat.*, xviii. 18. [3] *Ib.*, 1.

'First Resurrection' of saints preceding a Millennium and the second resurrection unto Judgment. That thought does not seem to have been in S. Cyril's mind, and it rests on misunderstanding of doubtful texts. St. Cyril does not seem to have believed in two Resurrections, but only that S. Paul's words to the Thessalonians taught that *the dead in Christ* should have the privilege of rising first: 'Let us wait and look for the Lord's coming upon the clouds from heaven. Then shall angelic trumpets sound; *the dead in Christ shall rise first*,[1]—the godly persons who are alive shall be caught up in the clouds, receiving as the reward of their labours more than human honour, inasmuch as theirs was a more than human strife; according as the Apostle Paul writes, saying, *For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*'[2] Our Lord delayeth His coming, and it is often hard to remain steadfast at the post of duty, but this clause of the Creed sounds in our ears the trumpet call of hope. When He comes we shall triumph over sin and death. 'We look for the resurrection of the dead.'

And the life of the world to come.—As compared with the phrase of the Jerusalem Creed 'life eternal' this emendation is not easy to explain. It is not less Scriptural, being quoted in the First Gospel from our Lord's lips (Matt. xii. 32). It may draw attention to the fact that the future life will be a life lived under new conditions rather than a repetition of the life here. The phrase is found in a Creed presented by the heretics Arius and his friend Euzoius to the Emperor Constantine, and in the Creed of the Apostolical Constitutions (Bk. vii.) which we have traced to Antioch. Probably the Creed of Arius has Antiochene rather than Alexandrian connections, since he had been taught in the school of Lucian the Martyr. And in any case there is no dogmatic inference

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 16. [2] *Ib.* vv. 16, 17.

to be drawn from the phrase as if this variation in any way supported Arian teaching. It is the most puzzling emendation of all, because S. Cyril rather loves to repeat the words 'eternal life.'

'For ours is no trifling aim, but our endeavour is for eternal life. . . . The real and true life then is the Father, who through the Son in the Holy Spirit pours forth as from a fountain His heavenly gifts to all; and through His love to man, the blessings of the life eternal are promised without fail to us men also. . . . And the ways of finding eternal life are many. . . . For the Lord in His loving kindness has opened, not one or two only, but many doors, by which to enter into the life eternal, that as far as lay in Him, all might enjoy it without hindrance.'[1]

[1] *Cat.*, xviii. 28, 29, 36.

CONCLUSION

The Nicene Creed stands in no need of apology. But it suffers a great deal in the estimation of ordinary men through their ignorance of its proper historical background. I hope that this little book will do something to supply necessary information. What many men fail to understand is the fact that all the great heresies, Arianism included, arise from tendencies common to the human mind in every age and everywhere. The little son of a distinguished philosopher, Sir William Hamilton, came to him one day with the question: How could the Lord Jesus be both God and Man? He suggested an answer, which he was told was wrong. He was sent away to find a better, but before he found it he hit in his childish way on all the chief heresies concerning the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. This proves that we must expect that all those heresies will reappear from time to time. It supplies also a fresh argument in favour of the Vincentian Canon[1] that the true faith is that which is believed everywhere, always, and by all. Many, and sometimes very futile, objections have been raised to this canon, but they apply only to ill-judged misapplications of it. By itself it states no more than the obvious fact that Truth is one, and our single aim as defenders of the faith is to maintain the harmony of truth in the confession of Christ by S. Peter in the Gospel, by S. Paul and S. John in their letters, by S. Athanasius and the Great Councils, and by innumerable believers down to the present day, who, in every variety of style and in many grades of culture, agree to call Christ their Master and worship Him as the Son of God. As Vincentius put it in another striking phrase, we do not say new things but in a new way.

[1] Vincentius of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, c. 2.

But there is a far more serious objection to Creeds, felt perhaps more often than it is stated, that they are attempts to express more than words can utter of the mysteries of the Divine Nature and Personality. It is well met in the following words of Dr. Mill: 'It is a mistake of the nature of the Creeds, to suppose that their definitions pretend to grasp the whole matter revealed, and to bring its unfathomable depths within the cognisance of the understanding. They profess only to methodise, and bring into a compendious shape, easily remembered and repeated, the great outlines of the Faith once delivered to the saints.'[1] That this was the feeling in the minds of some of the greatest Nicene teachers has already been shown in the striking words of S. Hilary of Poitiers, which I have quoted above.[2] The importance of it has been insisted on more than once. But this is a truth which each age must restate for itself. Time after time men will return with profound thankfulness to our Nicene Creed, as expressing in balanced sentences, and in true perspective, the outline of the Revelation given to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. As has been well said: 'Words are the fortresses of thought.' In these words we entrench our conviction that this Revelation is true.

'THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH AND DWELT AMONG US, AND WE BEHELD HIS GLORY, GLORY AS OF THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN FROM THE FATHER, FULL OF GRACE AND TRUTH.'[3]

---

[1] *Sermons on the Temptation*, ed. 3, 1873, p. 17.
[2] P. 18.
[3] John i. 14.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

THE GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS OF THE CREED FORMS QUOTED ABOVE

I. The Creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea

(Socrates H.E. i. 8 or Theodoret H.E., i. 11)

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν,
πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε
καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν·
Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον
θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς,
υἱὸν μονογενῆ,
πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως,
πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ
τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένου,
δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα·
τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
σαρκωθέντα,
καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον,
καὶ παθόντα,
καὶ ἀναστάντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,
καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ
κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς·
[Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα
ἅγιον.

The Creed of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325

(according to the text of Hort, *Op. cit.*, p. 140).

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν
πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
πάντων ὁρατῶν τε
καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν·
Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς
μονογενῆ—τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ
τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς
θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ φῶς ἐκ φωτός
θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν
τῇ γῇ.
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν
σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα
καὶ σαρκωθέντα,
ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα,
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
ἀνελθόντα εἰς [τοὺς] οὐρανούς,
ἐρχόμενον
κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.
Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα

Τοῦτον ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν
πιστεύοντες, πατέρα ἀληθῶς
πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν ἀληθῶς
υἱόν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς
ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καθῶς καὶ ὁ
κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ
κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς
εἶπε· πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες
αὐτοὺς
εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ
τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνέυματος.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· Ἦν ποτε
ὅτε οὐκ ἦν καὶ πρὶν
γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ
ὅτι Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο,
ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως
ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι
[ἢ κτιστὸν] ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ
ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
θεοῦ, [τούτους] ἀναθεμα-
τίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ
ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

II. The Creed of Nicæa in Latin

As prefixed to the Anathemas of Pope Damasus about A.D. 378-80

(Collated with the MSS. Turner, *Op. cit.*, p. 99)

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem [omnium] uisibilium et inuisibilium factorem :
Et in unum Dominum uestrum Iesum Christum,
Filium Dei,
natum de Patre unigenitum,
hoc est de substantia Patris,
Deum de Deo,
Lumen de lumine,
Deum uerum de Deo uero,
natum non factum,
unius substantiae cum Patre, quod graece dicunt homousion,
per quem omnia facta sunt,
siue quae in caelo siue quae in terra ;
qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit,
incarnatus est,
homo factus est, passus [est et] resurrexit tertia die,
ascendit in caelos,
uenturus iudicare uiuos et mortuos :
et [in] spiritum sanctum [neque facturam neque creaturam sed de substantia deitatis].
Eos autem qui dicunt : Erat [tempus] quando non erat, et Priusquam nasceretur non erat, et quia Ex nullis extantibus factus est, uel Ex alia substantia siue essentia dicentes mutabilem et conuertibilem Filium Dei, hos anathematizat catholica et apostolica ecclesia.

III. The Earlier Creed of Jerusalem

(Restored from the Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril: Hort, *Op. cit.*, p. 142)

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς,
ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.
σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα,
ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρός,
καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·
καὶ εἰς ἓν ἅγιον πνεῦμα,
τὸν παράκλητον,
τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·
καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,
καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν
καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν,
καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

IV. The Creed of Constantinople

or Revised Creed of Jerusalem.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς,
ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
φῶς ἐκ φωτός,
θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν,
καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου,
καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα
καὶ ταφέντα
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρός,
καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.
Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν,
τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν·
Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν,
καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

V. The Same in Latin

The 'Constantinopolitanum'

(As quoted at the 2nd Session of the Council of Chalcedon)

SANCTA FIDES QUAM EXPOSUERUNT SANCTI CL. PATRES CONSONA SANCTAE ET MAGNAE NICAENO SYNODO

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae, uisibilium omnium et inuisibilium:

et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum, ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula, Deum ex Deo, lumen ex lumine, Deum uerum ex Deo uero, natum non factum, homousion Patri hoc est eiusdem cum Patre substantiae, per quem omnia facta sunt; qui propter nos et nostram salutem descendit* et incarnatus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria uirgine, homo factus, et passus est sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit,* ascendit in cælos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, iterum uenturus in gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos, cuius regni non erit finis:

et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et uiuificatorem, ex Patre* procedentem, cum Patre et Filio conglorificandum, qui locutus est per prophetas: in unam* catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam; confitemur unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum; expectamus resurrectionem mortuorum, vitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

IN TWO FORMS

THE 'CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM'

(As quoted at the 6th Session of the Council of Chalcedon)

ITERUM SYMBOLUM CENTUM QUINQUAGINTA

Credimus in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae, uisibilium omnium et inuisibilium:

et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum, natum ex Patre ante omnia saecula * * Deum uerum de Deo uero, natum non factum, consubstantialem Patri per quem omnia facta sunt; qui propter nos homines et salutem nostram descendit * et incarnatus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria uirgine, et humanatus est et crucifixus est pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato * , et sepultus est et resurrexit tertia die * , ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, iterum uenturus [est] cum gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos, cuius regni non erit finis:

et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et uiuificantem ex Patre * procedentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et conglorificandum, qui locutus est per sanctos prophetos: in unam * catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam; confitemur unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum: expectamus resurrectionem mortuorum [et] uitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

The asterisks * * denote the points at which later texts include additions as follows:—'Deum de Deo,' 'lumen de lumine,' 'de caelis,' 'passus, 'secundum scripturos,' 'Filioque,' 'sanctam.'

VI. The Stowe Missal.

Credo in unum deum patrem omnipotentem factorem caeli et terrae ; uisibilium omnium et inuisibilium :

Et in unum dominum nostrum ihesum Christum filium dei unigenitum natum ex patre ante omnia saecula lumen de lumine, deum uerum de deo uero, natum non factum, consubstantialem patri per quem omnia facta sunt, qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de caelo et incarnatus est de spiritu sancto et Maria virgine et homo natus est, crucifixus (etiam) pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas et ascendit in caelos, et sedet a[d] dexterum dei patris et iterum uenturus cum gloria iudicare uiuos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.

et spiritum sanctum dominum et uiuificatorem ex patre procedentem, qui cum patre et filio coadorandum et conglorificandum qui locutus est per prophetas, et unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam, confiteor unum baptismum in remissionem peccatorum, spero resurrectionem mortuorum et uitam futuri saeculi. *Amen.*

I have quoted the text of the first hand, correcting the spellings. A later hand has added 'filioque' and other words between the lines, now assigned to the tenth century.

LITERATURE

F. J. A. Hort, *Two Dissertations.* Cambridge, 1876.

B. F. Westcott, *The Historic Faith.* Macmillan (second edition), 1883. (Cheap edition 6d.)

H. B. Swete, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.* Deighton, 1876.

J. Kunze, *Das Nicänisch-Konstantinopolitanische Symbol.* Leipzig, 1898.

A. E. Burn, *Introduction to the Creeds.* Methuen, 1899.

H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism.* Cambridge, 1900 (second edition).

C. H. Turner, *The History and Use of Creeds and Anathemas.* S.P.C.K., 1908.

E. C. S. Gibson, Bp. of Gloucester, *The Three Creeds.* Longmans, 1908.

INDEX